The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXI NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 23, 1935 NUMBER 1051

...A'S COLLEGE
...CITY, TENN.

Contents

The Week 287

Editorial

Liberalism Twenty Years After 290
The Russian Executions 292

General Articles

Universities in These Times ..... Harold J. Laski 294
The Press Faces a Union ..... Lawrence Brown 297
The Left Revives ..... Jonathan Mitchell 300
The President Fails to Vanish ..... Karl Schriftgiesser 301
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 302
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 303
Three Poems ..... Josephine Miles 304
Some American Paintings ..... Horace Gregory 304
Movies: Arms and Men ..... Otis Ferguson 305

Correspondence 305

It Droppeth As ..... Stark Young 308

Books in Review

The Good Earthling ..... Malcolm Cowley 309
The Literary Racket ..... Robert Herrick 310
Calverton on Religion ..... Eric Estorick 311
Marxian Fragment ..... Edmund Wilson 311
William Cardinal O'Connell ..... James B. Connolly 312
Martyr of Progress ..... Matthew Josephson 312
Books in Brief 313

The Week

NEVER was there any doubt that the Saar would vote to return to Germany, though a pro-Hitler majority of 91.1 percent in a vote of five-eighths of the population was higher than most impartial persons had expected. But the Saar population is 90-percent German, and powerful social, economic and political motives impelled it to vote for Germany. In particular was this true after the Rome agreement between France and Germany, two months ago, cut the ground from under the anti-Hitler organizations and made it obviously unwise for any Saarlander to be counted too conspicuously a friend of the status quo. But there were other factors. There was an element of loyalty to Germany that overrode personal objections to Hitler; there was an element, probably fairly strong, of honest belief in Hitler as the savior of the German nation; there was objection, at least on the part of the great mass of miners, to the French regime in the mines, with its lax safety standards and its ruthless, because obviously temporary, exploitation. No money was spent upon machinery, safety devices, and when to a rising accident rate was added a seven-eighths reduction of coal exports to Germany, the miners felt their only salvation lay in reunion with Germany. It is significant that in the mining and industrial towns the pro-Hitler vote ran the heaviest.

THERE is not the least doubt that Hitler's prestige within Germany and in the European foreign offices has been increased by the Saar vote. He has been able to make delivery on his promises, which is the *sine qua non* of both domestic and foreign politics. Germany gains economic and political advantages. France and presumably the Catholic Church—which gave all but official blessing to the reannexation movement and transferred to another diocese the one outstanding anti-Nazi priest in the Saar—are satisfied. The only sufferers will be the Saarlanders themselves. They have voted themselves into Hitler's Germany with but the slimmest promises of protection, and even these cover only the Jews and residents of three years or more. Emigrés from Germany have no guarantees whatever. Already Hermann Röchling, leader of the German Front, has said that 3,000 communists will have to leave the Saar or be interned, that the unemployed will be promptly packed off to the German labor camps. What are promises when the *Gleichschaltung* is under way?

IN HIS annual message to Congress, President Roosevelt declared that our relations with all foreign governments are amicable, that there is no war cloud in any quarter. A few days later, in his budget message, he asked the appropriation of $792,484,265 for the army and navy during the coming year. This is $180,000,000 more than was appropriated for these purposes for the present year, and $312,000,000 more than last year. With additional expenditures from the public-works funds, the total would be nearly one billion dollars—almost three million dollars a day. We do not need to recite again to our readers the effect that such huge expenditures—by far the largest ever asked of Congress in peacetime—would have upon other countries, and particularly upon Japan. We would simply stress the point that if the President's statement in his annual message is

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If any situation exists justifying such vast sums for armament, then the President's statement in his annual message showed an extraordinary lack of candor regarding the most important problem this country, or any country, can face.

WHAT is happening in southern China has to be pieced together from fragmentary items that come, for the most part, from government sources and are therefore designed to hide the truth rather than to reveal it. The Communists have *probably* abandoned the Central Soviet District in Kiangsi Province, though it seems that no foreign newspaper men have so far been permitted to visit the former Soviet capital. The Red Armies were more than a match for the Whites in land combat, but their arsenals, schools and hospitals were bombed from the air by American-built planes, and it was becoming difficult to maintain a stable Soviet government. Before retreating they dispatched an army northward, giving it the name of the Anti-Japanese Expeditionary Force. Its purpose was to rouse the countryside against the imperialists and, failing that, to create a diversion so that the principal Red Army would have more liberty of action. This Anti-Japanese Expeditionary Force has for some months been fighting a guerilla warfare in the hill country southwest of Shanghai. Having no base of supplies, it has been compelled to split up into half a dozen smaller bands that live off the countryside, taking one town after another, confiscating the property of the rich merchants and dividing land among the peasants. Such bands cannot maintain the strict discipline of the Red Army. It is possible, though not established by reliable evidence, that one of them was responsible for capturing and executing two American missionaries. The Red Army itself does not harm foreigners unless they are tried and found guilty of fighting against the revolution.

MEANWHILE the principal body of the Red forces has been making one of the most difficult and dramatic marches in the history of warfare. The story, once more, has to be pieced together from lies and rumors and little items of fact overlooked by the censors. It seems that the Reds suddenly abandoned their forts, their university, their bombed government buildings, and began filtering westward. Almost before the besieging White army knew what had happened, they had moved two hundred miles and cut the line of the railroad now being built from Hankow to Canton. They moved on, defeating some of the forces sent against them, evading others, capturing city after city and always advancing toward the great interior province of Szechwan, where the Communists already control a wide area. It is as if an American army should abandon its base in the Catskills and march to Chicago through a practically roadless territory ruled by its enemies. Such a march would be flatly [illegible] people and even the rank and file of the government troops along the route. From Kweichow Province, for example, it was reported that the whole army of the local war lord was on the point of revolting and joining the Reds. That was about two weeks ago. Since then it seems that part of the Red Army has penetrated into the southern part of Szechwan and has joined its comrades there, thus completing the first stage of the march. The next stage, probably, will be the attempt to unite with another Red Army in the north of the province and to set up a stable Soviet state that might end by liberating all of southwestern China from its landlords and war lords.

THE Hauptmann trial is another of those sorry spectacles that cause so many bitter or derisive comments upon American civilization among intelligent people in other lands. Hauptmann is being tried in the newspapers far more than in the Flemington courtroom. Several million words a week are being written about the trial by reporters and specially hired "trained seals," few of whom know anything about the law and some of whom were employed because of their reputations as authors of novels or movie scenarios. Every detail of the trial is photographed for the newsreels, reported on the radio and described in the newspapers at such length that even the President's message to Congress was relegated to second place in favor of the day's proceedings. Counsel for the defense make radio speeches, give interviews to the press, comment on testimony, announce their own moves in advance. If all this is not contempt of court, what is it? And how is it possible to conduct a fair trial under such circumstances?

ONE of the major casualties in consumer legislation last year was the failure of Congress to give the Food and Drug Administration adequate powers to regulate the sale and advertising of foods, drugs and cosmetics. Senator Copeland has now introduced a new pure food and drug bill which is intended, as was his bill of last year, to bring the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906 up to date. It is extremely doubtful, however, whether this new bill will give consumers the sort of protection that is urgently needed. The measure does not give the Food and Drug Administration authority to establish quality standards for foods—Grade A, Grade B, etc.—and to require canners to state on the labels of canned goods the quality of the food in the can. It does not require disclosure of the formulas of foods, drugs and cosmetics—manufacturers need only file their formulas with the Secretary of Agriculture, who cannot make them public. The bill does not require the label of a patent medicine to reveal whether it is a cure or merely a palliative for a disease. These omissions, especially the last, obviously permit hoodwinking of a high order. Since there are less than half a dozen [illegible] to medicine—genuine cures for par-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ticular diseases—it is indefensible to permit patent-medicine manufacturers to parade thousands of useless, even harmful, concoctions or palliatives before the public on the pretense that they *may* be curative.

OF COURSE, the patent-medicine men insist that Senator Copeland's bill—though it is clearly far weaker than the much disputed Tugwell bill of last year—is still a drastic measure, containing "extraordinary" powers of a dictatorial nature. Their tactics, quite obviously, are to attack any part of the bill that has the slightest appearance of offering the consumer real protection. By such tactics last year, they were able, piecemeal, to whittle the original Tugwell bill down until it was a mere shadow of its former self. The same strategy is already in evidence this year against the new bill. The food and drug interests hope, no doubt, that they will be able to force further compromises from the administration so that when and if any food and drug bill is enacted it will be a pretty harmless affair. One might ask appropriately, what about the administration's promise of a New Deal to consumers? Unfortunately, President Roosevelt's failure last year to back up the Tugwell bill effectively, even in its greatly modified form, affords little basis for hoping that he will now put on the pressure needed to force through a food and drug act that would be genuinely protective of consumer interests. As it stands, the new bill does bring cosmetics and advertising within the purview of the Food and Drug Administration. But a great deal more than this might have been expected of the New Deal.

ADD to the great discoveries of American business the fact that whispering has a commercial value. In addition to its other uses, whispering is now being employed to advertise various products in some forty American universities—including such havens of pure learning as Yale, Harvard, Smith and Johns Hopkins. An organization for this new utilization of whispering has been formed under the name of Campus Publicity Service. Started by Princeton seniors, it is now subsidized by large manufacturers who want their products talked about—favorably, of course. One cigarette company, we understand, pays $2,000 a month. Agents are hired at from $10 to $40 a month and their job is to go around the campus telling their fellow students that Blank's clothing is what the well dressed young man will wear (and nothing else) or that Gypso's Gin is what débutantes demand. According to the Service's official circular, the representatives are handpicked "with a special view toward their influential standing . . . and since the organization is made up entirely of undergraduates it is able to work with the aid of the college authorities." It seems logical to expect that the scope of this new medium will be widened, and it is probably only a question of months before the helpless consumer will be whispered at from all sides. (Already at least one commercial organization exists to do this in the general population, and the Campus Service may have taken its idea from the other, which was recently described in The New York World-Telegram.) If, therefore, some strange person comes up and tells you that a certain cigarette is good for the nasal membranes, don't be fooled. He is only a paid whisperer and should be told to go and do his whispering someplace else.

PREMIER R. B. Bennett of Canada, multimillionaire corporation lawyer, has recently executed a startling about-face. Only two months ago Premier Bennett forced the resignation of Harry Stevens from his Cabinet because of Stevens' criticism of big-business practices, Bennett then posing as a staunch defender of the old order. Now, in a series of nationwide broadcasts, he is telling the people of Canada that the old order is gone and will not return. He proposes, in short, a Canadian new deal: control of hours and wages of labor; increased taxation of large incomes; unemployment, accident and health insurance; abolition of child labor. The Premier's sudden dash to the left seems fairly easy to understand. It appears to be only an astute political move that is not unlikely to have the desired effect and ensure his reëlection. Meanwhile, the Liberals, traditionally the party of reform, find themselves temporarily far to the right, faint-heartedly championing laissez-faire. The socialist Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, on the other hand, is embarrassed by the superficial resemblance between Bennett's policy and its own, and its leaders fear that he may mislead many voters who have already been convinced that a change is badly needed.

A COMPROMISE, and not particularly a happy one, has at last ended the six weeks' strike of 700 employees of the Boston Store, one of the leading department stores in Milwaukee. It was one of the largest strikes of this sort in recent years and one of the most persistently fought, but when it failed to bring the store to terms by the end of the holiday buying season, the three unions involved—clerks, building-service employees and truckmen—concluded that they had lost their strongest tactical advantage and settled for a fraction of what they had asked. Their demands for a week's notice of discharge and for increased pay were given up, but the strikers gained a revision of the quota system, which will net an increase in pay of $1 to $3 per week, and machinery for the adjustment of grievances. The latter has the alternative possibilities of being developed into something of real use to the employees or into something closely resembling a company union. The strike suffered somewhat from the rigid parochialism of the strikers, who rejected outside help and friendly pickets, on the theory, apparently, that they could win more easily if they carried no taint of radicalism. It is rumored that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taint and accepted help from department stores in Milwaukee and other cities, which did not want to face the precedent of a successful department-store strike.

SOME weeks ago we published figures on the great increase of German imports of raw wool, hides, oil, copper and tin and commented on this significant indication of German rearmament. Recently Otto D. Tolischus in a special dispatch to The New York Times analyzed the figures for German steel production during 1934 and came to even more firmly grounded conclusions about the war preparation currently going on in the Reich. He found that against a 1932 steel production of 5,500,000 tons, Germany had produced 11,800,000 tons in 1934. When all possible civilian uses for this increase were accounted for, an unexplained balance of 5,100,000 tons remained. In some unacknowledged way Germany has consumed more than 43 percent of her year's steel production, an amount exceeding 90 percent of her entire 1932 production. In the same period her total industrial production increased by only 41 percent and her production of heavy goods by 68 percent. German rearmament may still be an official secret, but the only thing the rest of the world is in doubt about is the exact number of her tanks, guns and aircraft.

Liberalism Twenty Years After

THE NEW REPUBLIC when it was founded twenty years ago was, like the American nation itself, the inheritor of a liberal tradition. But nothing is more obvious than that the economic and social order to which a liberal philosophy gave birth and in which it flourished is rapidly degenerating and must in the course of time give way to some other. What use, in these circumstances, can anyone make of a liberal system of ideas? Must they be abandoned altogether for something that appears to be their exact opposite? Certainly they are not worth keeping simply because they are customary and venerable. It is one of the deepest convictions of liberalism itself that dogmas depending on mere authority are sure to be harmful, and if liberal beliefs cannot maintain their own validity through the test of reason in the crucible of a new situation, they are nothing more than dogmas. Liberalism must, by its own basic tenets, undergo a transvaluation into something else in a world that fundamentally changes. It may be, however, that in that transvaluation the hidden sources of vitality from which it sprang will still be found fresh and life-giving.

Long ago The New Republic ceased describing its tendency in economic discussion as a liberal one. For liberalism in the historical economic sense means a belief in individual business enterprise and a system of laissez-faire. Economic liberalism means John Stuart Mill. The conditions under which such an order can flourish have, within the past fifty years, definitely passed away. We now have that fearful monstrosity, private business enterprise concentrated largely in comparatively few hands, and regulated by the power of great wealth rather than by the automatic forces of competition. Laissez-faire is now both economically and socially impossible. A liberal may, indeed, agitate for its return, but the difficulty of such a position was betrayed not long ago by a leading economist, a close student of our business system, who prescribed small business and competition as the remedy for our ills. What, he was asked, would be necessary to effectuate such a reversal? "The first requirement," he replied, "would be a strong central government, uninfluenced by wealth." That seems to us a contradiction in terms, as long as great private concentrations of wealth exist.

It is clear that if we are neither to go back nor to buttress the existing system, the only other choice is an advance toward collectivism. Under a socially planned order, controlled by the interests of the masses, we should, in a sense, have the opposite of liberalism. But it is our belief that such an order finds its justification in the very type of aim that gave to historic liberalism its most solid philosophical sanctions. It was Adam Smith's desire to create an order in which the production of useful goods would be maximized, and international amity would be furthered. It was John Stuart Mill's desire that every individual should have the utmost opportunity for growth, for development of character and personality, and that this opportunity should not be restricted to a few, but should be equally shared. The development of capitalism has obstructed these high purposes. That, indeed, is the chief charge against it. We know now that if we are to have a society in which social wealth is to be large and secure, in which war is to be unlikely, and in which everyone is to have an equal chance at the things that make life worth living and at the pursuits that lend dignity to the individual, at least one kind of liberty must be ended—that is, the liberty of a few to amass wealth and power by ownership of the means of production. Their liberty to do this means intolerable restrictions on the welfare and freedom of others. The founders of the liberal philosophy would have been the first to declare this truth if they were living today.

Much of the difficulty of modern liberals arises from a literal verbalism, which assumes that liberty is an absolute, a sort of universal abstraction. Interfere with any kind of liberty, or with the liberty of any person, they are fond of saying, and you endanger all liberty. But this is a fundamental error. Liberty is meaningless aside from the person who exercises it and the objectives for which he strives. Liberty to do one kind of thing necessarily involves a choice not to do another kind of thing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

becomes more extensively true as the life of that society becomes more closely integrated. We have to decide what objectives we want most, and what exclusions the choice of these ends necessarily involves. In every society liberty is relative and is restricted at many points. In none is this more true than in a society that, by pretending it is wholly free, fails to make an intelligent choice of concrete social ends and thus becomes a confused battleground for conflicting forces, each of them fighting for its own interests at the expense of all the others.

Nobody really has a liberty that in fact he cannot exercise. Thus, all Americans today have an abstract "right" to engage in business and accumulate wealth, but since only a few thousands of them are in a position to exercise this right, it does not compensate the vast majority for the correlative losses of liberty that the system imposes on them, such as losing the freedom to have a job, or to earn enough to support a family in decency, or to end the hundreds of injustices and tyrannies exercised in the course of maintaining the present system.

Certainly a belief in democracy, which goes hand in hand with the basic tenets of liberalism, must uphold the necessity of having that social organization which is best adapted at any particular time to the needs and human attributes of the masses, just as it must support the right of the masses—it would have been called a "divine" right in 1800—to bring about such an order. This attitude of democratic philosophy is more basic than a commitment to any particular type of constitution or electoral machinery, which is after all only a device supposed—and sometimes wrongly supposed—to have been established in order to assure the opportunity of the masses to exercise their rights. The test of such devices is not their historical sanction or their purely mechanical design, but the question whether they are well adapted under the circumstances to effectuate the main object in view.

Confusion on this matter often leads liberals to emphasize the superficial legal machinery at the expense of the reality, and to fritter away their efforts at changes that do not matter. It is often objected, for instance, that a system of social planning would involve delegating important decisions to a board or some other body of political executives to such an extent that a virtual dictatorship would be established, that our Constitution would have to be abandoned, etc. But this argument overlooks the obvious and admitted facts that in a modern, complex industrial civilization, the important decisions cannot be made by the same methods as in a New England town meeting or a Greek city-state, that the most important decisions are now left to the private rulers of industry, and that they in fact exercise domination over government. What the propertyless citizen faces in reality is a choice between being ruled by capitalistic ~~ their agents and, on the other hand, delegating the functions of economic management to more genuine and competent representatives under a system where pains are taken to consult his welfare and his wishes, as a matter of fundamental right.

Liberals can even, it seems to us, embrace within their philosophy the process of social change ordinarily called revolution. They cannot of course approve autocratic government by self-seeking cliques or by groups that harbor ends hostile to the basic tenets (as differentiated from the superficial mechanisms) of liberalism and democracy. But they must admit that, historically, revolution has been an essential part of social evolution; no liberal order itself was established without shifts of power from one group of classes to another, usually accompanied by violence or war. This nation was established by a revolution, and had another in the middle of the nineteenth century when dominance passed from the slave-owning aristocracy of the South to the industrialists and farmers of the North. Civil violence is even more destructive, temporarily, than international war, and inevitably carries with it, for the time being, more suppressions of liberty than are necessary after a new order has established itself and become stable. No humane person would choose it. But the question is not often practically put in this way. An insurrection against a going and dominant regime that is supported by a majority of the people is almost never successful and would be attempted only by fanatics. But if the old regime fails conspicuously, and if a new one holding the loyalty of the masses is established—as it often is established during revolutionary crises by almost peaceable if not indeed by constitutional means—the rulers who have been thrust from power and the classes whose property is being confiscated are likely to resort to violence to protect their privileges. In that case the choice is whether to resist them or to sacrifice the revolution. The liberal decision in such an event must rest, it seems to us, not on any abstract choice between elections and force—a choice which in the circumstances does not exist—but on approval of the aims of the revolution.

Even the present regime, as Herbert Croly wrote in 1922, relies ultimately on force, and since this is so, a class warfare is inevitable. "The present constitution of society," he said, "renders a dangerous conflict of this kind necessary and even desirable." But such a conflict must have its losses, both tangible and intangible. "It is no less necessary," he wrote, "that American society should brace itself to avoid being impoverished by a dose of such medicine. There is no reason why it should be impoverished, provided it remains faithful to the essentially democratic practice of submitting all such conflicts to full and fair discussion."

One frequent charge against liberalism is that it places far too much reliance on discussion as a solvent of conflicts, that it emphasizes things like

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

speech, education. People in reality are moved by interests, habits, and by the prejudices depending upon them. It is hopeless to try to change one system into another merely by persuading and educating the people who are conditioned by it. In a superficial sense there is merit in this charge. No mind that is open to the extent of reëxamining all its preconceptions every day could ever stimulate action; indeed, no such mind really exists. Persuasion that assumes that large numbers are not affected by their interests and can be influenced solely by reason is so innocent as to be naïve. Purely objective consideration of any subject, unaffected by any sort of bias, is rare indeed, and perhaps rarest among those who blandly assume that they are capable of it. But the just alternative is not to seize upon unreasoning dogma and blind prejudice. A mystical and obfuscatory program of that kind leads straight to Hitler. If there are reasons for denouncing a fascist regime, as compared with a socialist or communist one, they must be those that are fundamentally liberal in their derivation—a belief in the brotherhood and inherent value of man, a belief in equality, a belief in objective reason and science, a belief in material welfare. It is particularly necessary to emphasize these values in a revolutionary period; indeed, the perils that arise from their loss are tragically apparent in Germany and Italy. In a sense that Herbert Croly did not recognize when he wrote, a transvaluated liberalism has a stern duty to perform in minimizing the impoverishment that is incidental to great conflicts.

This function has its place as well in the disputes that occur during a less rapid period of transition, and particularly among those who in one way or another are seeking a new and better social order. There is a place, in our opinion, and an important place, for a journal that does not pretend to foresee the future with such precise accuracy that it presents a hard-and-fast, detailed program and fights for it with all the resources of controversy and invective. Our readers sometimes want to know "what we stand for"; they want us to line up with the Roosevelt Democrats, the Progressive Republicans, the Socialists, the Communists, the Workers' Party, the Farmer-Labor Political Federation—or with more specialized groups, the Townsend Pensionites, the Utopians, the Douglas Creditors. We frankly prefer some of these movements to others, but we see no need for becoming a new political party of our own, or joining, as a publication, any of those that exist. Our general direction, our main policies, are clear enough, but as to the rest we should rather present the varied points of view of those who are in the same large procession; we should rather exercise the privilege of criticism, favorable or the reverse; we prefer to mediate, as well as possible, among the many schools of radical thought and between them and people who have not yet made up their minds. When the time for larger social crisis—it is necessary to take sides, and often to choose one of two, neither of which is completely satisfactory. We shall from time to time, as we always have done, endorse or oppose specific combatants, specific ideas, specific projects. But we shall also hold the door open for the expression of opinion and the exercise of reason among those who are moving toward a collectivist society. We hope to participate, within the ranks of those who believe as we do that capitalism has outlived its usefulness, in the difficult search for objective truth, in the exercise of tolerance toward those who disagree (though not toward their opinions or acts if we believe them wrong) and in the conservation of those precious human values without which any social change would be meaningless.

The Russian Executions

THE RECENT executions in Russia have been received with very adverse comment throughout the Western world. Most of this has come from quarters already hostile to the Soviet government, and must be discounted because of that fact. Some of it, however, has come from persons who are in general sympathetic with the U.S.S.R. These individuals argue that the persons executed following the assassination of Kirov were not given public trials, that there is doubt as to the guilt of some at least of these individuals, and that the Soviet government seized the opportunity presented by the assassination to do away with persons whose degree of difference with themselves is so slight that in another country they would merely be members of an opposition political party. Thus, the General Council of the British Trades Union Congress and the Executive Committee of the Labor Party have made a joint public protest in which they referred to these executions as "reprisals" and indicated a "profound sense of shock and alarm" that they should have taken place. Similar expressions have come from individuals and groups in the United States that have heretofore on the whole been friendly to the Russian experiment.

It is obviously impossible, at such a distance from the scene, to discuss with authority what has happened in the U.S.S.R.; but some points can be made on a basis of reliable information which is now available. We should first note that, contrary to the prevailing impression, the individuals executed following the Kirov assassination were not shot without a trial. They were tried before the military tribunal of the Supreme Court of the Soviet Union. It should further be noted that no outstanding political figure in the U.S.S.R. has been executed. Those who met this punishment were individuals unknown even to many high officials of the Soviet government. The only prominent political figures whose names have been mentioned in connection with these proceedings, Kamenev and Zinoviev, [illegible]. It is safe to assume that if they

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been implicated in the general plot, they would have met the same fate as the ones who were found guilty.

Those executed were in two groups and it is important to distinguish between them. The first and by far the larger consisted of 103 persons described as "White Guardists" or "Russian Fascists," most of whom had recently stolen across the border. Their purpose was to carry out a general anti-Soviet campaign, but they had nothing to do with the assassination of Kirov. Although the Russian secret service had long known about this group of terrorists, it had postponed arresting them for a reason that actuates government police in any country in postponing such arrests as long as possible: namely, the effort to identify as many conspirators as possible before finally closing the net. If Kirov had not been assassinated, the chances are that these White Guard conspirators would have been arrested, tried and executed, perhaps a few at a time over a period of many weeks or months. However, in the midst of the consternation caused by the first attempt in many years against the life of a prominent Soviet leader, the order went out that all known terrorists should be arrested and tried immediately.

The second group, consisting of fourteen persons, was the one directly implicated in the assassination. This group included several Communists opposed to Stalin and presumably supporters of the ideas of Leon Trotsky (though not connected organizationally with the Trotskyites). They were executed, however, not because of their ideas, but because they were engaged in an active campaign to disorganize the Soviet government by killing off its leaders.

These are facts that were not fully presented until after the executions. Indeed, criticism frequently heard is that the Soviet government has acted in defiance of world opinion, by not explaining what was happening within its borders and, in particular, by not giving the accused public trials, where all the evidence could be brought forward. As to the first of these points, the failure of all governments to understand and act upon the reaction of foreign public opinion is notorious; one is hardly more guilty than the rest. As to the second point, it may or may not be valid. At least one possible good reason exists, however, for the secrecy of the proceedings. The Soviet government has now charged, as bluntly as a government can do, that some of the executed counter-revolutionaries were paid and directed by German Nazis. It seems fairly clear that the testimony in such a case, if made public, might bring about a critical international situation, involving the danger of war; and this the U.S.S.R. is determined to avoid if it can possibly be done.

Throughout the history of the Soviets, there have been many cases of counter-revolutionary plotting. Some of the conspirators have acted as spies for foreign gover[illegible] sented hostile Russian groups ranging from Tsarists to supporters of a capitalist republic, Socialist Revolutionaries or Opposition Communists. In many cases these individuals wormed their way into high places in the government or the Communist Party; instances are known where such spies remained inactive, without communicating with their principals, for a decade before beginning any hostile activity. To Americans, it may seem almost incredible that such activity should continue so long, and under such apparently hopeless conditions. The point to remember is that Russia was the scene of a bitter civil war not much more than a decade ago. Those who recall how long it took to liquidate the bitterness of our own Civil War will have a clue to the fierce flames of hatred that have continued to burn underground in Russia. They have been even fiercer because Russia is a country that throughout its whole history under the Tsars never had political freedom and was ruled always by that terrorism which inevitably breeds terrorism in response. No fact in the modern world is more poignantly apparent than that social institutions, characteristics and habits tend to survive even after the conditions that called them into being have passed away. Under these circumstances, it is a genuine tribute to the Soviet government that in recent years the number of overt acts by counter-revolutionaries has steadily diminished until in 1934, prior to the Kirov affair, it had reached the lowest point in the history of the U.S.S.R.

To say all this is not to say that the Soviet government is incapable of making mistakes for which the Russian people suffer, that it does not sometimes act with needless rigor or that a group of ideally gifted administrators might not have shaped their course to avoid many of the resistances that have been encountered. All these things are obviously true. Governments are directed by imperfect men in an imperfect world. In the light, however, of seventeen years of the history of the U.S.S.R., and particularly when we review the same seventeen years in the history of the capitalist governments of the West, fairness demands a suspension of judgment until all the facts are available.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY JOHN T. FLYNN
WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN W. P. MANGOLD
LEWIS MUMFORD GILBERT SELDES R. G. TUGWELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MO[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Universities in These Times[1]

I

UNIVERSITIES exist for the promotion of learning, and to that end their obligation both to teach and to research is, no doubt, essential to their life. But their function is not complete when they have performed these tasks. A university's title to respect is a function of its insistence that it can neither teach nor research save in the atmosphere of freedom. To the degree that it fails in its service of freedom, to that degree also it destroys the indispensable condition of creative achievement.

The enemy of the university without, therefore, is orthodoxy. It may present itself as the servant of wealth, of a political or economic creed, of a religious faith. In so far as any university submits to the demands of these, it prostitutes its power to serve truth. For, by such submission, it limits, both for its teachers and its students, that power to let the mind range unimpeded over fundamental questions through which alone essential discoveries can be made. Academic freedom is the nurse of intellectual inventiveness.

As orthodoxy is the enemy of the university without, so are inertia, love of power and lack of courage the enemies within. The only duties the teacher owes to the university are the duties to think hard, to think freely and to think independently. He has the obligation to devote himself to his subject. He has the obligation to allow no convention to stand in the way of announcing the truths to which his instructed judgment may lead him. He has the obligation, finally, to call no man, be that man party or government or church, his master. Those who are silent because the truth within them may be inconvenient or costly or dangerous, in the end will become silent because they have nothing to say. The man who suppresses the thing he believes he knows to be truth will in the long run neither teach well nor research well. For neither task can be performed when one has the lie in one's soul.

II

These, no doubt, are commonplaces; but in a time of spiritual crisis, like that through which we are passing now, insistence upon the essential commonplaces may be as urgent as the discovery of new truth. All over the world the lamps of reason are going out. The universities, over great areas that once were free, are being prostituted to the service of creeds, racial, economic, political, that make intolerance the cornerstone of their house. The teacher who does not conform is dismissed. The student who ventures to doubt is expelled. The free mind is replaced by the conforming mind. The search for truth is subjected to the demand that teachers and taught alike repeat the dogmas of an orthodoxy that thousands of them deny in their hearts even while they affirm them with their lips. The right to criticize is being stifled with a cruelty more intense than anything Western civilization has known in nearly four hundred years.

III

The reason for this temper is not far to seek. We are remaking the foundations of our civilization. As always, at such an epoch, habitual values are challenged; values once deemed essential are being transformed. Mankind has lost its sailing instructions and is the prey of the panic that is born of insecurity. The fundamental questions have once more been raised, and those who stand by the ancient answers are prepared to fight rather than allow new responses to be formulated. They are intolerant because they are afraid.

In such an atmosphere, the universities have no moral alternative but to be militant about their right to freedom. To conform to the prescriptions of power is to betray the only standard in which they have a title to confidence. They know that there is no epoch in the history of mankind in which insistence upon conformity would not have meant the stereotyping of error. They know, also, that this is not less true of our epoch than of the past. Either they must proclaim the right freely to speculate upon matters of ultimate social constitution or they must play traitor to that reason which is the only master they can recognize.

It is, of course, no easy task to maintain this attitude. Power never welcomes challenge; by its nature it asks for exclusive dominion. By its nature it will, if it can, destroy if it be not allowed to fulfill itself. A university that ignores the claim of power to obedience invites the possibility of suppression. It risks poverty. It provokes anger and hostility from every interest it threatens by its attitude. It makes learning uncomfortable and dangerous. It is an attack upon the equilibrium that power seeks to maintain. Yet unless it assumes its obligation to maintain this temper, whatever the cost, it has no hope of preserving its self-respect.

IV

But it is not enough to struggle for freedom

[1] This article is the first of a special group by various writers, prepared at the invitation of The New Republic in commemoration of its twentieth anniversary. The second in the group, which will [illegible] D. C. A

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a great international company of scholars to whom, as scholars, the boundaries of states are devoid of meaning. Truth cannot be confined within a frontier and intolerance is a disease that does not limit itself to the frontiers of a state. When, therefore, academic freedom is attacked, no university can sit silent. Its obligation is the duty of protest. That is no simple matter of formal resolution. It involves activity, urgent, immediate, courageous. For the power that is intolerant pays no heed to formal resolutions. It knows from long experience that men become only too easily habituated to despotism. It has at its disposal endless means for stifling the critics it encounters. It can buy support with money or recognition. It can count on that inertia that shrinks from action; it can lie its way to acceptance of its methods. Truth has been often worsted in an encounter when men have not been vigilant about its discovery.

For when, as in Germany today, truth is suppressed by the intolerance of power, protests go but a little way. What is in jeopardy is men's lives, what is put to the hazard is their right to perform the only function that can give meaning to their existence. It is no answer to such jeopardy and such hazard merely to register one's conviction that they are regrettable. It is action only that awakens the intolerant to a sense of the crime they have committed. The university, at such a time, has definite salvage work to do. It must open its own gates to the dispossessed teachers and students. It must give a welcome to those who are exiled in the name of truth.

It is inconvenient, no doubt; but who ever knew a battle for freedom that took thought for our convenience? It is costly, also; but it is nothing to the cost that, in the long run, is the price of leaving intolerance unimpeded. It asks for the sacrifice of our wonted routine; but those whom it is our obligation to help have sacrificed all they have, some of them even their lives. It may mean the postponement of some cherished scheme of university expansion; but in the long run, again, to be inactive before intolerance means a challenge to the very right of a university to be at all. It is inconvenient, we are insistently told, to our own rulers that we should challenge the action of a power with which they are formally at peace. But against this may be urged, first, that the private citizen does not have his moral obligations defined for him by his rulers, and, second, that inactivity before intolerance abroad soon degenerates into inactivity before intolerance at home. To fight for the exile of freedom is, quite literally, to safeguard our own liberties. To teach a lesson to a foreign government by an example of generosity is by implication to teach a lesson to our own. No government has a record so stainless that it does not need the lesson.

It may be objected that this assumes that a university has a single mind, that it can move along a united front to this goal of action; consequently, since the habit of a university is variety of opinion, to set such an example may provoke dissent within its own ranks. To this there are at least two answers. The teacher who is unwilling to fight intolerance is an unworthy member of his profession, for he is untrue to the sole condition upon which his effectiveness as a teacher depends. It is, therefore, in the second place, not an appeal to teachers to abandon any conviction which, as citizens, they may have on matters of social constitution. It is to ask from them only this, that in the realm of the mind they set no penalty upon the habits of thought. It is to ask them, by safeguarding the right of others to think freely, the more securely to safeguard their own thought. What is sought from them is not the abandonment of conviction but the assurance that there shall be no interference with it. Once again, if a university cannot attain unity of outlook upon this principle, it lacks the self-respect that alone entitles it to be part of the company of scholars.

V

Since the war, intolerance has grown by leaps and bounds. The number of places where a man is free to think without let or hindrance narrows year by year. There has been wave after wave from Russia, from Italy, from Germany, from Austria. It may be Spain tomorrow; it may be France the day after. There have been ominous rumblings even in an English university built by its founders in quest of a freedom more wide and honorable than they could then discover in more ancient seats of learning. No man can say with any assurance among what people, or for how long, the search for truth is destined to remain free. Unless we act now, while there remain oases in the vast desert men are making, it may tomorrow be too late.

The universities, therefore, have the obligation corporately to act while there is still time. They need an international organization for the protection of academic freedom. It should be a federal body, built upon national associations for this purpose. It should be built upon the guarantee of security of tenure to teachers in all matters of opinion. No university that is not prepared to admit to its teachers freedom from all censure or penalty in respect of their expression of opinion in any sphere of thought should be permitted to join. Teachers themselves should regard it as an obligation to serve no university that is not prepared to make this guarantee a pivotal part of its charter of articles. They should assess themselves proportionately to their salaries, year by year, to build up a fighting fund to safeguard all scholars who suffer penalties by reason of the challenge of power. From such a fund visiting fellowships should be founded to obtain for all professors penalized for their opinions an opportunity to continue their academic careers. The international body should have the power to protest to governments against any interference with academic freedom. In suitable cases

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

like the League of Nations. It should be prepared, at the instance of any of its constituent national bodies, to investigate and report upon any cases where academic freedom is violated. It should be willing, in similar circumstances, fully to protect the interests of the student body against the kind of aggression typified by the recent action of President Robinson in the City College of New York. For this purpose, it should be prepared to coöperate with all representative student organizations that can make out a serious case for inquiry.

Such an organization has long been needed. Its purpose is, deliberately, wider than that of existing bodies like the Academic Emergency Committee in New York or the Academic Assistance Council in London. Admirable as is the work they have done, they are in essence charitable organizations. They alleviate distress; they do not insist upon rights. Something more is required. The time has come to give the international fellowship of learning a corporate voice that may speak with authority. The need is urgent to insist upon universal standards of freedom for which a body of distinguished men can fight with the knowledge that, behind them, is the corporate feeling of an influential opinion.

Such a body as I suggest could do more than merely alleviate suffering. It could definitely challenge the attitude of mind that is prepared to use the infliction of suffering as an instrument in its search for power. It could, if it acted promptly and continuously, put intolerance on the defensive in this field. It could do more. By its defense of its standards for the academic profession, it could create in wider spheres a habit of mind that would do much to inhibit those tyrants, great and small, who make conformity to their own outlook the measure of respectability. It could give encouragement all over the world to men and women whose present quest for truth is hampered and impeded by the rigor of despotic orthodoxies. It could prevent the dead hand of past convention descending as a chain upon the movement towards novelty of thought. If it did its work with courage and persistency, it might give to the universities those title deeds to a full freedom too long withheld from them.

VI

I do not deny the difficulties inherent in the creation of such an institution as I propose. Men whose conformity to accepted standards leaves them with a sense of freedom will declare that it is unnecessary. Those who specialize in fields unlikely to be the scene of battle will shrink from the erection of the challenge it implies. All who are themselves of illiberal temper, or eager for a power they can now exercise without correction, will oppose an idea intended by its very nature to limit the authority they desire to possess. Let me reiterate that the purpose of such an institution is to safeguard academic freedom, and that I mean by this freedom for teacher [illegible] whole field of ideas with which a university concerns itself.

I do not deny the difficulties. But I urge that the need is so overwhelming that no men who care for freedom in this realm will allow such difficulties to stand in the way of its realization. Anyone who knows the history of the universities will recognize the urgency. We must not deceive ourselves with the thought that what has happened in the years since the War is a temporary mood that will pass, for the likelihood is rather that it will be intensified. But even if that were true, the assault on academic freedom remains both widespread and insidious. There is the subtle corruption of endowment—a standing temptation to all universities to seek the teacher who will conform or the researcher capable of immediate and dramatic results in his inquiries. There is the danger, inherent in university control by business men, that seeks to make of universities places where the rights of business men shall receive doctrinal support. There is the danger of control by legislative or ecclesiastical authority for the protection of the vested interests it embodies. The tragedies for which each of these has been responsible have been long and costly; for intolerance has more victories to its credit than we care to admit. What ends in each age is less the battle itself than the scene upon which the battle is fought. What we need, if we can obtain it, is the recognition at long last that the price of this battle is more than civilization can afford.

For we have got plainly to confront the chance that, in the prospect now opening before us, it is at least possible that the tradition of speculation itself may be lost. There have been dark ages before in the world; unless we take action against their onset, there is no inherent reason why they should not come again. Surely, of all institutions universities have the obligation to arm themselves against their coming. They can only live well as the freedom to speculate is respected. That is the condition of effective teaching; it is the condition, also, of creative research. A university that does not question accepted doctrine over the whole field of its activities is in no full sense a university at all. The obligation it has to serve truth is also an obligation to refuse to set boundaries to the possibilities of thought. No doubt, thereby, it is engaged in an adventure that, by its very nature, is perilous to vested interest, to settled doctrine, to orthodox opinion. No doubt, therefore, also, it will harbor uncomfortable men, unconventional men, men who seem dangerous to all whose first thought is to dwell at ease in Zion. That is the university's glory. That is the contribution it ought to make to the enlargement of the horizons of the human mind. For the degree in which it can do this very thing is the measure of its power to fulfill its end. And the criterion of its honesty of purpose in that adventure upon which it is engaged is its willingness to fight for that freedom without which it can neither dignify nor create.

London. HAROLD J. LASKI.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Press Faces a Union

NEWSPAPER men in the era of such plays and moving pictures as "The Front Page" and "Gentlemen of the Press" were supposed to be people who had seen all, known all and were gradually dying of alcohol to avoid dying of boredom. Even in the heyday of such romanticization of newspaper men this picture was felt to be exaggerated, though having some justification. The general impression prevailed, even in the city room, that the average reporter was rather a dashing sort of individualist whose only attitude on society or its woes was one of personal bitterness that it supplied him with such poor liquor and so few girls. The thought of such a creature turning to and building himself a union was either ludicrous or tragic as you cared to look at it.

Actually there was a measure of reason in this romantic opinion. Reporters did work under outrageous conditions, for poor pay and with no hope of permanence. As remedies they took to publicity, politics, romanticizing or drink, to anything, in short, except wrestling with the realities of their own trade. The attempt to apply a cure in the city room by the power of an organized union had been thought of now and then, even tried locally a few times, but had always come to quick grief. Long after playwrights, novelists and actors had organized for the protection of themselves and the general orderliness of their industries, the newspaper field remained to all outward appearances the least fruitful ground for unionization of non-manual workers. The prospect seemed so hopelessly remote that in 1922 the International Typographical Union threw away its charter right to organize the reporters.

In one year this has changed, changed completely and over the entire country. It was on December 15, 1933, that the American Newspaper Guild was officially organized. Everybody said nice things about it. The President received the Guild's representatives; General Johnson promised them a place on the Newspaper Industrial Board; even the publishers were verbally cordial. It was the temper of the times; besides, local newspaper men's unions had come and gone before. But this one did not go. Instead it grew stronger rapidly—distressingly rapidly from the publishers' view. For instance the New York Guild, one of the component organizations within the American Guild, had only 1,000 members last February. In May it had 1,500 and today it has over 2,100 members out of a total of 3,500 newspaper men—by the most generous estimate—in the city. The American Guild now has a membership of nearly 10,000 out of some 24,000 newspaper men and women in the country.

When it became evident that the Newspaper Guild was a real force in the industry, the verbal cordiality gradually changed to discreet political hostility. The publishers had two main lines of opposition: legal and economic. Through the first they attempted to keep the control of labor relations of their industry safely in the hands of the Newspaper Industrial Board, a body on which they had four representatives, the mechanical unions three and the Guild only one. Since the Board was safely divided four to four—and of the labor representatives only one represented the news men—it could be relied upon to produce, at the worst, unending deadlock and delay. Further, its rules of procedure effectually kept out any evidence the publishers did not want introduced. So far the publishers' confidence has been justified; for the Industrial Board has yet to render a significant decision favorable to the Guild. To date it has been largely a forum of confusion.

But the legal front of the publishers has not been maintained with uniform success. The Jennings case, by establishing the Labor Relations Board as a higher authority than the Industrial Board, has left a clear legal field for the Guild to invoke Section 7a and all the penalties of the N.I.R.A. against publishers who discriminate against Guild members or refuse to sign a contract with the Guild after an agreement has been reached. Whether invoking Section 7a will produce the enforcement of Section 7a is a problem no one has yet tried to solve. In other industries it has not proved to be an all-powerful piece of magic, but at least it is good publicity. With the newspaper men, however, it is of even more dubious use as a practical step; for the Jennings case, particularly in the forced rehearing, has shown up the devious hostility of the N.R.A. toward the Guild. Yet the victory must be worth something or the publishers would not be so upset about it.

The publishers' economic battle, however, has gone forward relatively undisturbed. The past year of growth for the Guild has been a year of nearly uninterrupted struggles against discrimination and discharge. The outstanding case was, of course, that of Dean Jennings of The San Francisco Call-Bulletin. But Jennings' case was in no way exceptional. Louis Burgess, chief editorial writer of The San Francisco Examiner, was fired because, said Mr. Hearst, editorial writers should not belong to a union lest this give them a class bias, something which Mr. Hearst's public spirit could never brook. The discharge of Burgess was a defeat for the Guild because the Regional Labor Board refused to order his reinstatement and the Guild has been un-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

On The Staten Island Advance, Alexander Crosby, the news editor, was fired, last July, a week after he joined the Guild. The publisher, S. I. Newhouse, found that Crosby was incompetent, though he was oddly slow in discovering it. Five times in the five years that Crosby worked for him, Newhouse gave him a raise, the last one only two months before the amazing discovery. The case is now pending before the Industrial Board, but to date nothing has been done. For a time the Guild conducted a vigorous picketing campaign and entered a working agreement with the mechanical unions (The Advance is the only open-shop paper in Greater New York), but Newhouse has won all the skirmishes. The Advance still runs and Crosby is still fired.

Many more cases of this nature are still pending before the Industrial Board. The Boston Traveler fired the chairman, vice-chairman and another member of the Guild. Il Progresso, an Italian-language daily in New York City, faced with 100-percent Guild organization, promptly discharged the chapter chairman. Some of the important evidence in the case was barred from the record by the Industrial Board and the matter is now safely deadlocked. The San Francisco Examiner demoted Redfern Mason, a veteran music critic of twenty-five years' experience, to the hotel beat and caused him to resign. In many cases such tactics have worked. After Jennings' resignation The Call-Bulletin chapter sank to an inactive handful, and with the further example of Mason before their eyes the newspaper men of San Francisco have been cautious in their support of the Guild. Chicago is another city where fear of reprisals has kept the Guild weak.

But the Guild's record is far from a monotonous catalogue of discrimination and defeat. Last April it signed a contract with The Philadelphia Record, published by J. David Stern, organizing a preferential Guild shop under which the first opportunity in filling vacancies is to be given to Guild men. In October contracts were signed with all the dailies of Madison, Wisconsin, establishing a completely closed-shop town so far as news men are concerned. But in a measure these were friendly contracts; in no case were the publishers strongly opposed to the Guild and negotiations were carried on in an atmosphere of harmony.

The Guild's first fighting victory was gained in Cleveland, where a dispute between the Guild and The Cleveland News was conducted at times with great bitterness. At one point the Guild was ready to vote a strike, but negotiations were resumed and on December 15 a contract was signed establishing a minimum salary of $40 for a five-day, forty-hour week, a four-year period for apprentices, dismissal payments, and provisions for overtime payments or compensatory time off. The contract makes no provision for a closed or preferential shop, but the publisher has agreed to enter three-cornered negotiations on this with the Guild and The Cleveland

These terms are less than the proposed code requirements which the Guild was to offer at the N.R.A. hearing in December but did not because of the Jennings rehearing. (They will be presented at the reconvened hearing this month.) These call for a standard $45 minimum salary for one-year journeymen, higher overtime rates and higher dismissal payments or parallel length of notice. But the Cleveland contract is none the less a signal advance for the Guild. It is a contract won in the face of opposition and it is the first breach in the publishers' solid front of uncompromising hostility. It recalls the warning in a private memorandum of Harvey Kelly, now chairman of the Industrial Board, circulated by the American Newspaper Publishers' Association last winter warning members that contracts were very dangerous. Now that one large publisher has broken the solid front who will find it wise to be next?

Elsewhere negotiations for contracts are currently going on. In particular this is true of many of the papers of the extensive Scripps-Howard chain; for their liberal professions make it difficult to resist the logic of the Guild's request for contracts. On The New York World-Telegram—probably the test case for the chain—matters are hanging fire. An agreement about hours and conditions had been reached between the Guild and Mr. Roy Howard, but Mr. Howard refused to embody this agreement in a signed contract. Members of the Guild have pointed out that Section 7a requires that a contract be drawn up once an agreement has been reached. They have therefore urged the Guild to take the case to the Labor Relations Board, but The World-Telegram unit has been uncertain of the wisest course and the Guild has hesitated to take the matter into its own hands.

Even the policy of reprisal has not been altogether successful in keeping the Guild membership down. For example, the discharge of eight men by Lucius T. Russell, publisher of the Newark, New Jersey, Ledger, instead of discouraging the Guild and weakening it on the other Newark papers, produced a prompt and vigorous strike that is still in progress. Day and night the Guild maintains an active picket line that has brought out several scabbing reporters and has publicized the Guild's case to Newark and residents of surrounding towns. There have been mass meetings, sound trucks, all the paraphernalia of the typical industrial dispute (except strike riots—perhaps it is considered injudicious to beat up newspaper men). Above all there has been enthusiastic support, from the heart and the pocketbook, by newspaper men and women, Guild members and not, from all over the country. As one metropolitan society editor said, "After all this is our fight"—and ordinarily you would not expect class solidarity from a society editor.

So far the Newark strike is a draw. Mr. Russell is still publishing, but his local news is weak and his

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Some advertisers have left him. Advertisers buy readers, and as the word spreads through labor circles in New Jersey that The Ledger is an enemy, advertisers find they are buying fewer readers and more ill will.

A more recent strike and one fought for a different reason is that against The Jewish Daily Bulletin in New York City. Since last summer The Bulletin has been operating under a Guild agreement, and though J. L. Landau, the publisher, has never denied the validity of the agreement, he has merely failed to pay the salaries it called for. He has admitted owing the money but insisted that he could not afford to pay it. After long negotiations the Guild unit finally laid down an ultimatum: all overdue salaries to be paid by February 1 or the unit would strike. Mr. Landau at first refused, but a three-day strike that forced The Bulletin to suspend publication quickly brought the publisher to accept the Guild's terms in full. The former agreement goes back in force with overdue salaries paid, and negotiations for a full contract will begin next month.

The Ledger strike, particularly, brings out another Guild problem, one that has caused some friction here and there within the membership. After all it is an anomaly that the striking reporters should be winning the support of union men all over northern New Jersey while good union men in The Ledger building still set the type, cast it and print the paper. It is not, of course, an anomaly in the trade-union world—the anomaly is logical not practical—and in near-by Paterson, where there is a strike of typographers, the mechanical unions could not even coöperate with one another, let alone with reporters. The task of coördinating the work of the Guild with that of the mechanical unions is one of the most difficult, and yet necessary, problems that face the Guild and one on which the membership is not of one mind regarding either theory or tactics. Each mechanical union has its own contract, each contract runs for its own period of time. Nor are the officers of the mechanical unions eager to go so far in helping the Guild that they endanger their generally cordial relations with the publishers. But if the Guild and the mechanical men can work out some system of mutual assistance, it will be a great advance for both.

This tactical problem of union coöperation brings to issue in the Guild a problem of a slightly different nature, a problem, essentially, of political and economic philosophy. Is the Guild an organization of white-collar workers, or is it an association of professional men? Can it use the weapons of class struggle, the strike, the boycott, the picket line and mass demonstration, or should it have a code of ethical tactics and confine itself to discussion, heated and pointed perhaps, but still discussion, with the publishers? The majority of the members frankly think of themselves as belonging in the first category; they are, in their own minds, members of a labor union, and to many of them of a class-conscious labor union. They feel they have a community of class interest with the working people of America rather than a community of professional interest with the editors and publishers.

To the publishers this group, whose views the management of the Guild largely represents, seems ominously leftward in its politics. For instance there are unemployed units without dues in the larger Guilds and these units function as regular, full-fledged chapters of the Guild to which they belong—a noteworthy departure from usual trade-union practice, where the tendency is to set up a serious division between the employed and unemployed—with consequent tendencies toward scabbing by the unemployed and toward excessive "job consciousness" by the employed. Parallel with this in point of sentiment has been the unanimous endorsement by the National Convention of the Guild at St. Paul last June of the Workers' Unemployment Insurance Bill, a measure with open Communist Party backing, and recently the Guild delegated two representatives to the Washington meeting of organizations supporting this bill. Not that the Guild has any Communist affiliations whatever; its attitude here comes from broad social interest in the welfare of men and women who work for their living. At this moment there are also negotiations going on for joint action with the A.F. of L. to resist the tactics of the publishers and the N.R.A. in the Jennings case.

The newspaper business may be as slipshod, ill organized and insecure as ever, but the reporters' outlook on it has changed. The newspaper men now have a union, an aggressive and growing union that in its first year of life has already gained such important victories over the publishers that the latter are now taking steps to abandon their code and be the first industry to defy the recovery machinery of the Roosevelt administration. The publishers' official case is the technicality of whether their code can be modified without the consent of each subscribing paper—they insist that the Labor Relations Board's decision in the Jennings case, in effect, did modify the code. They paint a picture of an all-powerful government bureaucracy taking over control of the press on the strength of this precedent. The realities of the situation are somewhat different, however; particularly since the N.R.A. is so anxious to rid itself of the precedent that it has refused to force compliance in this case, referring that problem back to the Industrial Board, where it is likely to be deadlocked or referred back to the N.R.A.—the process known as the National Run Around.

The bureaucratic menace is a figment for talking purposes; the Constitution and Article VII of the Press Code are as effective blocks as can exist against government control of the press. The real fear of the publishers in the precedent of the Jennings case seems to be the power, present and above all potential, of the American Newspaper Guild

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Left Revives

MORE THAN twenty-five hundred delegates attended the Communist-controlled unemployment-insurance conference in Washington, January 5-7. Nearly all had undergone discomfort and hardship to get there. Many came two thousand miles or more in automobile trucks or day coaches. A few delegates, like Dirk de Jonge, indicted leader of the Oregon unemployed, came from the Pacific Coast. Most of them couldn't afford to eat in restaurants, and fed themselves in the basement of the Washington Auditorium, where the sessions were held. They could not afford hotels, and quartered themselves in boarding houses and the homes of sympathizers.

The conference devoted itself entirely to the bill for unemployment insurance that had been introduced in Congress by Representative Ernest Lundeen of Minnesota the day before the delegates met. Nothing else was mentioned, and the Lundeen bill—the workers' bill, most speakers called it—was thunderously approved.

On the final day of the conference, groups were sent to Mr. Roosevelt, to several Cabinet officers and to Congress, to urge the bill's adoption. The groups were received, if at all, with frigid impatience. That 2,500 men and women had sufficient concern for their social fate to travel long distances to Washington, that they could agree on a single, definite legislative measure, and that they then were unable to gain even a few minutes' hearing from the Roosevelt administration—these facts are worth noting.

In the nearly two years since Mr. Roosevelt was inaugurated, an immense amount of resentment against his administration has slowly collected, like potential lightning on a sultry day. Certainly the administration's failure to enforce Section 7a of the N.R.A. has disillusioned trade-union members. The unemployed, blithely promised economic recovery two years ago, are suspicious and sullen, as relief workers will tell you. Very little of this resentment has fastened upon Mr. Roosevelt himself. Even in the unemployment-insurance conference at Washington, his name failed to bring the boos and catcalls that greeted, for example, the name of William Green. But latent hostility to the administration palpably exists, and, under proper leadership, could be canalized into a political protest movement.

In the present session of Congress, the likeliest concrete issue around which the left anti-Roosevelt opposition can gather is the Lundeen bill. From the point of view of practical politics, it is an almost perfect issue. Under the bill, every worker who is unemployed would receive, as a matter of right, the prevailing wage in his locality, but in no case less than $10 a week, with $3 additional for each dependent. These payments would be met by supertaxes on incomes of more than $50,000, and by increased corporation taxes. The money would be distributed by elected committees of workers. Because of its simplicity, the Lundeen bill makes a better issue than Upton Sinclair's EPIC, better perhaps than Dr. Townsend's old-age-pension scheme. What politician dares say it is wrong to tax the rich for the benefit of the unemployed?

Again from the standpoint of practical politics, the Lundeen bill has the merit of being past the phase at which varying texts are being proposed and disputed over. It is actually before Congress, and assured of committee hearings. Lundeen himself is a sturdy fighter, and probably he can count on the support of a number of other Middle Western representatives.

The importance assumed by the Lundeen bill at the present session of Congress, however, must depend on the unofficial leadership back of it. The intention of the administration is to smother the bill quickly and quietly in committee and, instead, bring out its own relatively pale, ectoplasmic proposal for federal aid for state unemployment-insurance systems. Advocates of the Lundeen bill must openly challenge the administration, and attempt to make their own measure an issue before Congress. More than three hundred A.F. of L. locals sent representatives to the unemployment-insurance conference in Washington; the Lundeen bill is already certain of wide rank-and-file union support. Such organizations of rural workers as exist have committed themselves in the bill's favor. But if the bill can once be lifted to the status of a fighting issue, it is altogether likely that it will gather in support from many unsuspected sources, and that it may serve as a rallying point for the first effective left opposition Mr. Roosevelt has had to face.

The present leadership behind the Lundeen bill is primarily Communist and, in the past, efforts of the Communists to work with other groups have not been fruitful. However, in the unemployment-insurance conference at Washington, the Communists showed themselves notably wise, patient and skillful. Every shade of political opinion was represented, and angry conflicts repeatedly threatened within the credentials and resolutions committees. Very adroitly, the Communist leaders succeeded in keeping discussion confined rigidly to the Lundeen bill, and, aside from ritualistic gibes at William Green, no left groups, doctrines or theories were mentioned except in praise. Perhaps the correct approach to a rank-and-file united front

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever seen in this country—at least for the moment—was brought about.

Again from the standpoint of practical politics, what is most needed is an individual leader to personify the issue contained in the Lundeen bill. No such personality now exists, and this lack is the gravest handicap the left forces suffer under. Of those who addressed the conference, the placid, saintlike Mary van Kleeck is a newcomer to party politics. Representative Lundeen, as yet, is insufficiently known. The Communist leaders, Earl Browder, Clarence Hathaway, Herbert Benjamin, are possibilities, but none of them appears to have the power of arousing the emotional loyalty of heterogeneous masses of people possessed in a high degree, for example, by William Z. Foster.

JONATHAN MITCHELL.

The President Fails to Vanish

THAT BIG, bad "communist plot" to kidnap the President of the United States and his Cabinet, which was blazoned across the front pages of the Hearst press (and in other newspapers which should have known better), was but one of many scurrilous uses made of the McCormack-Dickstein Committee to aid the Hearst Red-baiting campaign now in full swing. According to the Associated Press report, "Walter S. Steele, of Washington, D. C., appearing for the American Coalition of Patriotic, Civic and Paternal Societies, said a Red plan was being widely circulated in communist circles to create civil war during a general strike; invade the White House; kidnap the President of the United States and his Cabinet; take over the government and supersede it with a Soviet State."

The facts of this plot are somewhat different from what one would gather from reading the newspaper accounts. Mr. Steele's own story contains no basis for a kidnap plot, and any newspaper man seeking the facts could have learned this for the price of a ham sandwich. He also might have known as much about it as Mr. Steele, or the Committee, as far back as December, 1933. For the entire plot has been available in a dime pamphlet since that time, and isn't a plot at all.

It would be an amusing story except for its vicious implications, though it would hardly be important were it not so clear-cut an example of the McCormack-Dickstein Committee's "evidence." Mr. Steele, who presented the evidence, makes his living as editor of The National Republic, probably the most reactionary magazine in America, except The Manufacturers' Record, and notorious for its Red-chasing proclivities. He is chairman of the "National Committee on Subversive Activities" of the "Coalition," which he represented before the McCormack-Dickstein Committee. This Coalition is composed of 109 "patriotic," "civic" and "paternal" organizations, including the Sons of the American Revolution and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, both of which have pronounced fascist tendencies.

In his capacity as editor and chairman of his committee Mr. Steele was in Wisconsin during the teamsters' strike last May. There, during a raid on what Mr. Steele calls a "strike school," a "document" was discovered. Contained therein was the dastardly kidnap plot. On November 24, the "Coalition" asked permission to present its discovery to the Committee. According to Mr. Steele, it was promised an immediate hearing, but he was not called until December 31. When he did appear he told of his discovery in Milwaukee and admitted that the same account of the plot contained in the document seized in Milwaukee was to be found in a pamphlet. He gave the Committee two copies. Each cost ten cents.

The pamphlet, available in any International Bookstore and in many other places, is M. J. Olgin's well known booklet, "Why Communism?" In purely academic tone, Mr. Olgin explains that, in all revolutions, after the revolters have won their fight, they "seize the principal government offices, invade the residences of the President and his Cabinet members, arrest them, declare the old regime abolished, establish their own power. . . ." This is somewhat different from The Associated Press's account. The order is different. The facts are different. There is no mention of kidnaping. It is, purely and simply, an account of what would happen in any government should the communists or any other revolutionary force take over the power.

But even more amusing is the fact that this book, first printed in December, 1933, by the Workers' Library Publishers, 50 East Thirteenth Street, New York City, is no secret document, but a well known tract, and must have been known to the Committee when it began its investigation, for any investigation of communism must surely have been started by reading available literature on the subject. But they waited months to make it public and then did so not only at the height of the Hearst anti-Red campaign but almost coincidentally with the release of a moving picture that, Mr. Steele believes, "may have originated from the same source as the document."

It is doubtful if the Committee, however, was consciously aiding the press agent for "The President Vanishes." It is reported here in Washington that Mr. Hearst, whose Cosmopolitan outfit produced the pro-fascist film "Gabriel Over the White House," did his utmost to discourage the showing of this new film attacking fascism. He is said to have sent his emissaries to the White House to urge presidential intervention to stop "The President Vanishes," but President Roosevelt is reported to have laughed at the charge that this film, which puts the munitions makers and the bankers in a bad light, was communist propaganda thinly veiled.

The Hearst papers—The Times and The Herald—in Washington made a big to-do about the "kidnap plot" and the papers were widely sold outside the Gov. Theatre on the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

shown. The Post gave the story a half-column on page ten. It looked at the time as if the McCormack-Dickstein Committee was doing for the film what Mr. Hoover once did for Mazda bulbs, but when the facts became known it then appeared as if the Hearst papers, unsuccessful in their attempt to ban "The President Vanishes," made use of the similarity between the film's title and the headlined "kidnap plot" to do a little circulation boosting and to help along Mr. Hearst's scare.

KARL SCHRIFTGIESSER.

Washington Notes

Mr. Roosevelt Is Pleased—What Is an Unemployable?—Self-Preservation in Politics —White House Confidence

NOW THAT the outbursts of applause and criticism caused by the President's message are over and only the secondary reverberations are heard, it is possible to appraise his attitude and judge his direction with relative calm. In my judgment, the President has once more given a demonstration of his ability to keep in the middle of the road and thus preserve support from both the liberal and conservative sides, persuading each that at bottom he is sound from its point of view and sympathetic to its philosophy. This is a game that Mr. Roosevelt has learned to play with great skill and one from which he derives amusement and pleasure. I am told by persons quite close to the throne that when he was informed that certain reactionary business leaders and the progressive Republican Senators simultaneously and equally expressed approval of some parts of his message, and were equally disgruntled at other parts, he gleefully shouted, "Wonderful, wonderful, just what we wanted." I really believe he enjoys puzzling people, and particularly loves to puzzle the Washington correspondents. They still crowd the White House press conferences, but a certain disillusionment seems to be spreading among them.

To return to the Roosevelt 1935 program as outlined in the January 4 message, it is significant to note that the one thing conservatives have seized upon to rejoice over is the policy announced by the President to pay on the new public works a scale of wages less than that prevailing in private industry, though more than is received by the "unemployables" left on the relief rolls. This is hailed as a great victory for the profit motive and it is argued that the President has thus corrected the great mistake of his 1933-34 spending and relief program and has put the whole business upon a sound basis. Some of his interpreters grow almost lyrical in pointing out what a "forward stride" this is and how sure everything now is to work out well. It is interesting that this particular recommendation of the President should so hearten the industrial leaders as to cause their foremost spokesmen to laud the message as more encouraging to industry than any move yet made by the administration. The fact is, actually, that this feature of the program is the one that will be most bitterly opposed not only by organized labor but by the liberals generally. Although it can be now bearing. Self-preservation is the first rule in politics, this issue will be distinctly one of that kind.

absorb the unemployed hinges upon this provision, many feel that it will open the door to a general lowering of wage scales by private industry and, furthermore, may easily be the means of losing all the ground gained by labor in the last generation. In any event it will be very hotly fought in the Senate and it will be surprising indeed if the four billion dollars the President has asked for is given him without some senatorial safeguard.

I think that Mr. Roosevelt was sold this lower-pay-level idea by one of his more detached unofficial advisers. He felt that it assured him of considerable business and journalistic support. It also rather appealed to him as a sound way of launching the new scheme, and as a vaccination against one of the most frequent complaints against the old relief system. He did not count on either the violent resentment to this proposal among some administration men who feel that he has been misled by an optimistic and impractical theorist, or the determined character of the fight that labor will make to prevent its adoption.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Roosevelt seems to have promulgated his new program without having given very much consideration to the more vital details—such as the possible dislocation of the whole wage level—that may follow the fixing of a low scale on government work. It is also true that he and everyone else in the administration seems extremely vague and hazy as to what yardstick is to be used in determining who are the "unemployables" to be left on the relief rolls or turned over to the states. Mr. Roosevelt asserts that they number a million and a half, out of the total of five million families now on relief. How he reached that figure, or whose figure it is, or what rule was used in arriving at it, have thus far been unexplained. There will, I think, be a rather determined effort upon the part of Congress to provide its own definition of an "unemployable," and if Congress has its way, I think Mr. Roosevelt will find his million and a half much reduced when the time comes to turn them back to the local communities.

The reason for this is not hard to understand. The local communities are already in a precarious financial condition, some of them because of the relief burden they are now bearing and others because of inability to collect taxes and general fiscal inefficiency. Most of them, in fact, are not far from the brink of bankruptcy. Any effort of the federal government to compel them to assume a greater share of the relief load than they now pull will quite naturally be resisted. They will look to their representatives in the House and Senate for protection.

There are two ways by which this protection can be afforded. One is to limit the number of "unemployables" who can be turned back by the government. This would not increase the burden on the states and might even lighten it a little. The other way is to enable the federal government to furnish the funds necessary to carry the turned-back cases. That Congress will insist on one of these methods seems extremely probable if one judges by the comments of those Congressmen who have a grasp upon the facts. Amenable as they are to Mr. Roosevelt's wishes, I believe that the vote will be almost unanimously against taking back any proportion of the load the government is

HATHITRUST DIGITIZED BY GOOGLE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two other phases of the new Roosevelt program seem to call for a passing mention at this time. There is the clear acceptance by the President's more ardent journalistic interpreters with whom he has talked personally and privately of the idea that the new four-billion-dollar public-works program means an abandonment of many of the New Deal policies of the past year—in fact, a virtual scrapping of the N.R.A. a revamping of the A.A.A. and a complete dropping of former P.W.A. methods. A rather strained effort is being made by the propagandists and the more naïve of the journalistic defenders to dramatize the new program with a series of new names and slogans, none of which seems to ring the bell. The reason for this is that it is not going to be easy to instil a vast popular enthusiasm about this project until some of the more basic questions it raises are adequately answered and some results apparent. I think a skeptical attitude is to be expected of a people whose hopes were raised so high twelve months ago, and who find today that the agencies by which unemployment was to be eliminated are dismal failures and about to be cast into the discard.

The other feature is the complete confidence of Mr. Roosevelt that in another year all our—and his—real problems will be solved. As to this confidence, there is not the slightest doubt. It is engaging and infectious, but it is not possible to forget that he was just as confident one year ago.

Washington. T. R. B.

Other People's Money

Uneasy Bankers—The F.H.A. Makes Some Claims—Spending The Mythical Gold Profit

TALK IS heard of another rift between the President and the bankers. These gentlemen feel that they are now crawling out of their holes and that they possess some power, which they can wield to bring the government to terms. The high talk that was heard in the summer and early fall about what they would require if they were to "coöperate" with the government is being heard again. They apparently do not realize how utterly they are at the mercy of the government. The government itself is also a little at the mercy of the bankers. And Washington as well as Wall Street is beginning to see why all this is so.

By June 30, the government must offer $4,600,000,000 of new obligations. In addition it will have to refund over $4,800,000,000 of notes, bills and Liberty Bonds. As to the fresh funds, whatever may be said for public consumption, the bankers are not eager to take any more government long-term securities. Why this is so may be seen from the statement of a large bank outside of New York. With $150,000,000 in deposits, it holds $106,000,000 of United States securities and another $14,000,000 of other government obligations. The capital and surplus of this bank is $8,000,000. A drop of seven points in government securities would completely wipe out the capital and surplus of this bank. And banks are fearful that if government borrowing continues, or if bonus legislation is passed or currency inflation is launched the government credit will be impaired at least to the extent of depressing the market on government bonds. A seven-point drop would not be unthinkable. And there are not a few banks whose capital and surplus would be wiped out or impaired by any serious decline in government bonds.

It is now quite apparent that it is to meet any possible resistance by the banks to further absorption of government obligations that the government is getting ready to put the Federal Reserve system into shape to handle the government's own financing or effectively to peg government-bond prices. The central-bank idea may have been abandoned by the administration, but it has not been abandoned by a strong bloc in Congress, and the administration has not abandoned the notion of taking possession of the Reserve system and recasting it to make it function as a central bank and as an instrument of Treasury policy. Altogether there are obvious signs visible of another brush between the President and the bankers.

The Federal Housing Administration has reports from banks that over $30,000,000 has been advanced by these banks for modernization loans. The F.H.A. claims credit for all these loans, which, of course, it is not entitled to, since a large part of them would have been made by the banks anyhow. But it claims a good deal more. Another set of "statistics" from various organizations around the country reveals that modernization work to the extent of $200,000,000 has been done since the F.H.A. got under way, which work was financed by home owners themselves out of their own pockets. That is, they paid cash for the work, without any borrowing. How the F.H.A. can claim credit for this I do not know. In New York City, for instance, alteration plans for the five boroughs during the entire year involved the spending of $28,000,000. But this was only $5,000,000 more than in the very bad year of 1933 when there was no F.H.A.

When it got under way the F.H.A. announced that it was going to put 5,000,000 men to work. Six months after the passage of the Recovery Act it can point to only $30,000,000 of loans for modernization and only a part of these can be legitimately attributed to the F.H.A. This is the time for the government to do what it should have done when the administration took office and what it was prevented from doing because it foolishly supposed the N.R.A. would produce recovery—launch a great campaign for low-cost housing directed and financed by the government.

Now, however, the F.H.A. is getting around to one of the plans for which, I suspect, it was launched. Apparently it is getting ready to aid in the bailing out of our defunct title and mortgage companies. It is said that a third of a billion dollars of their guaranteed mortgages may be refinanced under the insurance provided by the act.

Another item of interest was tucked away in the President's budget report. The Federal Reserve banks have been authorized to make loans to industry up to an outstanding total at any one time of $380,000,000. They have not, of course, approached that figure. To assist in this, the Treasury is going to turn $139,299,557 in gold over to the Federal Reserve banks this year and next. This will

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Deposit Insurance Corporation held by the Reserve banks. But where is the government to get this $139,299,557 of gold? Out of the gold profit. This is the first instance of any attempt by the government to spend any part of that mythical profit. It will probably not be the last.

JOHN T. FLYNN.

THREE POEMS

Definitions

The gentle keep their fingers near together,
Quietly, lightly lying, trained to touch
Nothing too much.

The craftsmen have heart, eyes, breath, waking in their fingers;
The wrist and thumb have done before the mind knows;
They are quick to close.

The fingers that will not stay together, that strain away,
That clutch too high or far, that ache to spread,
Are the fingers of the mad.

Ridge Route

Tehachapi south down with dust in the mouth
And hills that spin under wheels,
Wild lilac gray, and sunflowers sick of the sun,
And the ridge run.

Faint in the ears like a shout the shifting of gears
High on the grade behind, and ahead
Easing out on the road that takes again
The smooth speed of the plain.

The earth bent up into folds yellow and spent
Now passes in pale grass
To a new horizon, farther and more neat,
Cut clean with heat.

The round high pipes following low ground,
Lying apart, bear at heart
Water, water, for men's throats. And the breath
Of the town is in our teeth.

In Fear

What is a mouth to hold a heart in it,
To hold a fear in it bigger than heaven,
To give for nourishment a kind of bread
Sick, sweet, dry, without leaven?

What is a mouth whose lips must be wet over,
And over, and over, lest they close to air,
That has for teeth and tongue and words by them
No room to spare?

That is my mouth, that is my heart in it
That will not rise or fall,
That will not live or die but lie only;
It is not human, it is not mine at all.

Some American Paintings

THE SECOND biennial exhibition of American painting at the Whitney Museum in New York City presents a more uniform level of achievement than the showing of two years ago. The show is more compact, to begin with, and there are no spectacular extremes of good and bad work hung in opposition to each other. It appears that the contributors selected their canvases with considerable self-criticism and, as a result, some kind of Whitney standard seems to be forthcoming.

The geographical range remains quite as extensive as it was before. Grant Wood from Cedar Rapids, John Carrol from Detroit, Frank Mechau, Jr., from Denver, are represented as well as the artists who live in New York City and the areas surrounding it. The show as a whole is exceedingly interesting, the average rating is very high, yet there are few individual surprises—the most important of these being Alexander Brook's "The Sentinels," a particularly fortunate arrangement of cool blues and grays.

In general the exhibition is integrated by a singular spirit of unity and the general result, in the sense of its total impact, reflects a feeling of optimism. This feeling seems strange as we go into our sixth year of depression, but it remains true that the canvases on the Whitney walls are for the most part overflowing with brightness and good will. This is not to say that there were no notable exceptions to this rule. I remember a huge cartoon in oils, showing a capitalist and a mitered pope riding the backs of the workers. The painting itself was rather flat and ineffectual, yet there was no lack of realism. Silk hat and miter shone and muscular strain was evident in the broken weary bodies of the workers. Eugene Speicher's modernized version of Longfellow's "Village Blacksmith," a full-length portrait of "'Red' Moore," was another example of direct painting. Here was the blacksmith sitting, arms folded, in a chair; behind him the anvil, a horseshoe, a wagon wheel. Careful craftsmanship has gone into the painting of the figure, the brushwork is very skillful, close and clean; and yet, for all his realistic bulk, the blacksmith remains as lifeless as Longfellow's hero. "Mine Tragedy," by Irwin Hoffman, was the most impressive of the more somber canvases—two figures carrying a third, a dead man, out of a mine; the group reminiscent of a classic "Descent from the Cross." Conventional as the composition may appear, it deserves considerable respect.

Now that these examples have been noted, I think it may be truthfully said of the other painters that they have not digested the social material at hand. I suspect that many of them have found relief in painting American subject matter and that the recoil away from a prolonged French influence is giving them a new sense of vitality. Meanwhile, they are marking time. Grant Wood's "Arbor Day," a schoolhouse set in a green prairie, is very bright —almost too bright to be true. Soyer's small portrait of a girl, the half-dressed figure leaning forward, has excellent drawing behind actual painting and Ribak's industrial landscape, "Timber Yard," is solid and well conceived. Criss's Italian street, "Morning in Florence," has clarity and light, and Liberté's New York landscape shows that he is one

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is a feeling of cheerfulness, however, that one takes away from the show. This cheerfulness is not to be deplored, but it raises the question whether these American painters, looking at their various regions, have looked long and hard enough. They emerge, at the moment, as journalists in paint—accurate and capable but betraying no great understanding of what they are reporting. We may expect, therefore, now that a number of American painters have found themselves at home, another period of transition.

HORACE GREGORY.

Movies: Arms and Men

I CAN see at the start that this film, "Lives of a Bengal Lancer," is going to cause me a lot of grief, first, because from a social point of view it is execrable, second, because it is a dashing sweat-and-leather sort of thing and I like it. The story is one of men in a frontier division of lancers, and does what "The Lost Patrol" did more strongly last year, substituting for the customary emotional pull of boy and girl the emotions of the service. Kipling stuff. We're in it and it's pretty hot, but we'll take it off neat if it kills us, going down like men. (That is, like English men, because, in fiction at least, a Britisher who catches himself being a man invariably figures that qualities so unusual must be home products.) The colonel's raw cub of a son is brought out to India straight from military school, to carry on the family traditions, and he can't keep his diapers on and eventually gets popped into a bag by the natives (this, you feel, is a fine young squirt for grown men to chase after and lose their lives for). In the end he is shielded by surviving friends, so that it won't break old armorplate's heart, and there is a lot of stuff about this handful of iron men holding up the millions of India and the like. Every attempt to give it mouthfuls of meaning is either silly or a fine glorification of empire and the wars of empire; but somehow these drawbacks don't get in the way as much as it would seem.

The good part of the picture comes in its subsidiary business. There are stock situations, of course, such as rubbing a little nut oil on the face and passing for a native, the imminent Union of the Tribes, etc. There is the business of cavalry drills and formations, really done with great flourish and dash, and there is the life in quarters, the long file riding up to the fort and the well managed skirmish scenes, with machine guns spattering around and all. But occupying the best part of the footage is the main situation of men living together and getting in each other's hair, tied together by the strange bond of work and discipline, by the common pride of doing the job.

The execution of all this is what makes it effective. Franchot Tone and Gary Cooper make a convincing relationship by the solid types they build up, with their horseplay and nagging and rough loyalty. You would not have conceived how well they show up when there is no longer need for them to be draped around Miss Shearer's gown for sequence 28, night shot. The scene, for example, where one of them grubs a cigarette from the other, after both have just got through with having burning splinters driven under their nails, their hands fumbling and grotesque, is really strong enough not to be in pictures. The dialogue is laconic and good (when it is not in one of its declamatory moods), and Sir Guy Standing does a good version of the colonel, and C. Aubrey Smith is a fine man for these parts: he has a wide deliberate voice, and presence, and a face appropriately like an old army boot. The direction (Henry Hathaway) seems to show a high amount of skill, for there are not only difficult matters handled very well, but a lot of minor points where missing the beat would have soured whole stretches of the film.

And so I am taken by the show, imperialism and all. After all this fustian of Hollywood romance, I may be a pushover for scenes from the lives of men who live and work together, but I imagine that the glamor will get over generally, and I suspect we can't any more combat by detraction the dangers of having such stuff around than we could save the victims of a handsome woman by tipping them off that she was ugly as sin. And anyway, the important point here is not the glorification of the army *per se*. You see the same thing in shops and in a city room and on farms—men with their minds not on the money, like merchants, nor on just what interests they are serving, like Senators, but on hitting a good lick, on the rough satisfaction of combining finely with all the others to make the thing work, go off smoothly. And in a thing like this the real emotional pinch is not what ideal the men are going down for, but in the suggestion of how men do the impossible sometimes, doing and enduring in common.

Otherwise we seem to be in a low-pressure area for movies these last two weeks. Owing somewhat to Miss Anne Shirley's performance, "Anne of Green Gables" is just about the best treatment the theme could get. Essentially the film is made-up and monotonous—tragedy having its breakfast in bed. And "The Unfinished Symphony," an English version of Schubert and his more romantic troubles, is kept pleasant if not exciting mostly by the competent work of Hans Jaray and Marta Eggerth, and the Viennese Symphony orchestra. "Charlie Chan in Paris" is a very modest thriller. "It's a Gift" might have been written by Chic Sale and taken in somebody's cellar with a pocket kodak. (If it weren't for Fields, who can always do something to keep life bright, I don't think they would get their money back at that.) "The Right to Live" is one of those pictures that it is worth going to considerable trouble to avoid.

OTIS FERGUSON.

CORRESPONDENCE

Concerning the Townsend Plan

SIR: Your analysis of the Townsend Plan missed the point entirely so far as the raising of the money to finance the plan is concerned. Dr. Townsend proposes to raise the $1,600,000,000 a month required by his plan through a tax on business turnover, not on our annual income. Our national income is in the billions, but our business turnover or trade transactions amount to many hundred billion dollars annually. As money turns over, Dr. Townsend proposes to sluice off a small portion, which would be deflected into the hands of the old and would be used once each month by them and then passed back into the channels of trade where we all will be able to lay our hands on it.

According to "America's Capacity to Produce" and "America's Capacity to Consume," there was a difference of approximately $20,000,000,000 between our productive capacity and our consum-

DIGITIZED BY LINZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

our heads, it will be impossible materially to raise prices or to end the depression. Consumption must be brought up to a par with production. Purchasing power must be restored to the people. If you take the twenty-billion-dollar figure mentioned and divide it by eight million old folks, you will find that it amounts to approximately $200 a month. The wealth *is* there, it must be consumed; Dr. Townsend proposes that we go about consuming it, using the old folks as the primary vehicle for consumption. As long as this wealth is in evidence—as long as our government plows corn and cotton under and slaughters livestock by the millions—just so long is it foolish for The New Republic to say that we cannot afford to raise the money or that it is impossible to collect such a huge sum to make this transfer of goods to our old people possible. After all, money is but a token of wealth and if we are suffering from too much corn and cotton, it is certainly possible for intelligent people to devise ways and means of transferring tokens of wealth from one place to another in order that these so-called surplus goods may be legally redistributed.

Dr. Townsend and his followers—among whom are Ben Lindsey, Kathleen Norris and Augustus Thomas—may be "naïve" economists, but one thing is certain. They are honest folks, they do have the welfare of the average man at heart and they believe that "experts" and "economists" should be discounted in favor of common sense and directness of action. Fifteen million Americans *have* signed the Townsend petition and we propose to utilize the right of petition to Congress to put our plan across. We do not believe that the Congress can withstand the popular pressure of an overwhelming majority of our citizens as expressed through the United States mails.

FRANK PETERSON,
Director of Public Relations,
Washington, D. C. Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd.

[Mr. Peterson's letter misses entirely the point of our objection to the Townsend Plan. How can you possibly increase total buying power if the money that you give to one group of people is simultaneously taken from another group of people? That is exactly what any sort of tax on sales does. Call it a tax on business turnover, if you like, but every such tax, however small on the individual transaction, is added up and pyramided until it rests with full force on the ultimate consumer. Our total retail trade, according to official estimates, now has a money value of approximately $28,000,000,000 a year. Those who buy these articles would have to pay an extra $19,200,000,000 in order to give $200 a month to Mr. Peterson's 8,000,000 old folks. That would be equivalent to a sales tax of almost 70 percent. And, as a matter of fact, the number of persons over sixty is now nearer 12,000,000 than 8,000,000.

Here is an elementary propostion in economics for Mr. Peterson and his honest supporters to ponder: The purchasing power of the population cannot be increased unless (a) the total amount of money passing into their hands is increased more than the prices they have to pay, or (b) remains constant while prices fall, or (c) falls less than prices. Don't forget prices Mr. Peterson! Isn't this common sense of the commonest sort?—THE EDITORS.]

Spinoza and His Times

SIR: In The New Republic recently, Professor Paul Weiss advanced four arguments to show that in my book "The Philosophy of Spinoza" I have unjustifiably neglected to deal with science and mathematics, which, in common with others, he believes to be the basis of Spinoza's philosophy. Although Mr. Weiss's arguments are all his own, his point of view is that which now generally prevails among students of philosophy and even among professional scholars. I should like to examine his arguments one by one.

In the first place, he says, I have ignored Spinoza's "consuming interest in current scientific work" and also "the influence" which "Cartesian physics . . . undoubtedly had on Spinoza." I admit that in his correspondence with his friends Spinoza displays an intelligent man's natural interest in current events of science and that in his textbook on Descartes he outlines also some part of works and especially in his "Ethics," of which my book is a study, Spinoza deals neither with science in general nor with Cartesian physics in particular. All the science of the "Ethics" consists of a few sundry references to simple scientific facts and one physiological excursus. These I have not ignored. With the exception of these references and the excursus, the entire "Ethics" deals exclusively with problems of traditional philosophy and theology, from the definition of substance to the immortality of the soul. By no alchemy of sophistication can these be transmuted into Cartesian physics. My book, furthermore, happens to contain 242 references to the writings of Descartes, and in these the reader will find all the legitimate connections between Spinoza's philosophy and "Cartesian physics."

In the second place, arguing against my contention that the geometrical form of the "Ethics" was not a necessary consequence of its philosophy, Mr. Weiss says that Spinoza was a "rationalist" and "a mathematically arranged philosophy is a natural consequence of rationalistic assumptions." I take it that by "a natural consequence" the reviewer means "a necessary consequence," for this is the point at issue. Now the term rationalist covers a multitude of irrationalities. But it has never been used in the sense of one whose philosophy must be mathematically arranged. What the reviewer really does here is this: He first applies the term rationalist to Spinoza in a unique sense, evidently for no other reason than the uniqueness of Spinoza's use of the mathematical arrangement, and then proceeds to argue from that unique sense of the term rationalist that Spinoza's philosophy had to be mathematically arranged. Logicians have a word for this kind of reasoning. Furthermore, when the reviewer says that the present writer "forgets . . . the tremendous importance of the discovery of analytic geometry" in its bearing upon Spinoza's use of the geometrical form, he fails to take notice of my detailed discussion of this particular point in the chapter on "The Geometrical Method" in my book.

In the third place, he contends, Spinoza's denial of final causes in nature and design in God and free will in man "could be derived by the new science with its rejection of final causes and its emphasis on mechanism." This is partly true, but it has nothing to do with the case. The exponents of the "new science" were not themselves unanimous on these denials. Descartes for one did not deny free will in man, nor, if he is properly understood, did he deny design in God. Furthermore, the question is not what Spinoza could do, but what he actually did. If Spinoza had merely expressed a denial of final causes and design and free will, and we did not want to explain it as mere cussedness on his part, then indeed we could have found passages in the writings in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, no less than in the writings of ancient philosophers and even in medieval theologians, from which Spinoza *could* have derived his denial. But Spinoza does not merely parrot denials, nor did his philosophy develop like a rash out of the infection of heretical phrases. His denial of these three beliefs appears in the "Ethics" as the result of complicated arguments condensed into several series of propositions and demonstrations which in my book are discussed in Chapters IX, XII and XVII. These arguments cannot be found in the writings of the new scientists. I have examined carefully these writings and all I could find in them which had any literary bearing upon certain isolated statements in Spinoza's arguments were *two* passages in Bruno, *three* in Bacon, *one* in Campanella and *eleven* in Descartes, and these I have duly recorded in my book. Allowing for a few possible oversights, this is approximately the extent to which Spinoza's discussion of these topics can be legitimately connected with the "new science" of his time. Everything else in Spinoza's discussion, by force of documentary evidence, had to be built up on the basis of sources gathered from Aristotle, Cicero, various medieval authors, and Heereboord. As for the reviewer's specific reference to La Mettrie, it is irrelevant for an additional reason—La Mettrie was born thirty-two years after the death of Spinoza.

In the fourth place, he says, "it took Spinoza to find in the new views of mathematics a clue to the solution of the hoary problem of the relation of mind and body." This is an exaggerated if not altogether unfounded statement. In the thirteen propositions at the beginning of Part II, there is only one reference [illegible] as an example to illustrate a certain

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

point in the discussion. It occurs in the Scholium of Proposition VIII. That reference is not at all to "the new views of mathematics," and the limited purpose for which Spinoza has introduced it, as well as its medieval literary origin, is explained by me in Volume I, page 31. Mr. Weiss may perhaps think that this mathematical example could be expanded and transformed and made to serve as the key to the complete solution of the entire problem. But this is not what Spinoza did. Spinoza's own discussion of the problem, again by force of documentary evidence, had to be explained by means of sources gathered from Aristotle, various medieval authors, and Descartes. The reviewer's reference to "the influence" of Malebranche on Spinoza is wrong, for Malebranche's "Recherche de la Vérité" was published in 1674, only three years before Spinoza's death, when both the "Short Treatise" and the "Ethics" were already completed in manuscript. There are indeed several monographs which deal with general comparisons and analogies between Spinoza and Malebranche, and not especially with reference to the relation of mind and body, but they do not establish any influence of Malebranche on Spinoza. As for Hobbes, what is essentially characteristic of his theory of the relation of mind and body is not the same as what is essentially characteristic of Spinoza's theory. Nor is there any resemblance between their respective treatments of the problem.

No book says the last word on any subject, least of all on a philosopher. But there is nothing in the arguments advanced by the reviewer to justify his conclusion that my two volumes have neglected an essential aspect of Spinoza's philosophy so as to require a sequel of two additional volumes. Actually his strictures reduce themselves to the bare contention that I should have included in my book certain familiar references to the philosophers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries whom one habitually finds in the literature on Spinoza. Had I done so, the book would probably have been enriched by the addition of about a dozen new references, most of them without any direct literary bearing upon the text of the "Ethics" and none of them conducive to any real change in my interpretation of its philosophy. But my work is not meant to be a digest of extant interpretations of Spinoza; it is meant to be a new and independent reconstruction of his philosophy, substantiated by documentary evidence. Often indeed it is at variance with extant interpretations, with which it has to be critically compared and its demerits or merits determined, in each particular instance, on the basis of the evidence presented. Nor is my Spinoza divided against himself, as the reviewer says. This is not what I meant by the distinction between Benedictus and Baruch. Benedictus is only the mouthpiece of Baruch, and he stands fully explained in my detailed and substantiated explanation of what the explicit Spinoza "meant by what he said, how he came to say what he said, and why he said it in the manner in which he happened to say it." The sequel of two volumes, which the reviewer suggests, would have to deal, I am afraid, with what Spinoza did not mean by what he said. If the Spinoza who emerges from my book is, as Mr. Weiss says, not "a respected seventeenth-century lens-grinder and student of optics" but rather a disrespected "medieval scholar" and student of books, and if he does not conform to our conceptions of what a seventeenth-century philosopher should be, it is perhaps time to revise our views on both. The imaginary boundary line between medieval and modern in philosophy, anyhow, will some day have to be shifted and perhaps altogether abolished.

H. A. WOLFSON.

Cambridge, Mass.

SIR: Let me reiterate that Professor Wolfson has written an important work, indispensable to any student of the historic Spinoza. But it suffers from a serious defect. It does not take cognizance of the fact that Spinoza was greatly interested in and influenced by contemporary mathematics and science. Professor Wolfson seems to think that only one who believed that "science and mathematics form the basis of Spinoza's 'Ethics'," or that the "Ethics" deals "with science in general or with Cartesian physics in particular" could make such a criticism. He is mistaken. It seems to me just as bad to assert that the "Ethics" is grounded in the contemporary scene as it is to say that it has almost nothing

Professor Wolfson denies that Spinoza was deeply interested in contemporary science. He thinks Spinoza's correspondence and technical work indicate nothing but "an intelligent man's natural interest in current events of science." If Wolfson were right, "intelligent men" are extraordinarily subtle and a "natural interest" very rare indeed.

By a *natural* consequence I do not mean a *necessary* consequence.

The term "rationalist" was explained in the review, in a manner consonant with established terminology. That it applies to Spinoza is manifest from propositions 34, 35, 41, and 43 of Book 2 of the "Ethics."

I agree with Wolfson that the exponents of the new science were not unanimous in rejecting final causes, etc., and that Spinoza did not parrot the views of his contemporaries. But that does not mean that he followed those of his predecessors, or that he did not share a perspective with many "enlightened" men of his time.

Descartes, Hobbes and Malebranche do not provide "documentary" but "translational" evidence for Spinoza's solution of the mind-body problem. It is a philosophic passion to translate an idea from one domain into another, especially when the idea (such as that of analytic geometry) has revolutionized one field, and the concepts (such as interaction), employed in the other, have been shown by recent criticism to be unsatisfactory. It is this sort of evidence we need if we are to understand why the solution occurred when it did and what it meant to Spinoza and his contemporaries. It is because Wolfson does not admit that science and mathematics have great translational values, particularly for a Spinoza, that his work is less satisfactory and illuminating, and more one-sided than it might have been. It is also, incidentally, why he missed the gravamen of my criticisms and thought his reference to II, 8, Schol. was relevant.

The dates that Wolfson offers in connection with La Mettrie and Malebranche are accurate but irrelevant. Of course Spinoza did not copy from them. The point I made was that all of them saw better than Descartes the consequences that follow from Cartesian assumptions and that Hobbes and Malebranche undoubtedly helped Spinoza to see the point. If the evidence were conclusive that the "Ethics" was in its final form before Spinoza had an opportunity to read anything of Malebranche, one of my references would be in error. But even then the criticism would not be invalidated. I was interested in pointing out the "translational" significance of occasionalism for Spinoza, and the names of Clauberg and Geulincx would serve almost as well as that of Malebranche.

There is a sense in which the extant studies of the influence of science and mathematics on Spinoza are irrelevant to an understanding of Spinoza's philosophy; but in that sense, so is the whole of Wolfson's work. But if it is commentary and history that we want, we must not overlook the fact that the "Ethics" is the work of a man who was keenly aware of what was happening in the intellectual circles of his day.

PAUL WEISS.

Bryn Mawr, Pa.

Extracts from Letters

A STATEMENT of facts in the case of Charles Harris, recently given a sixty-day reprieve by President Roosevelt a few days before he was to be executed on a murder conviction, is contained in a communication signed by Herbert Gaston, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Charles Edward Russell, James P. Briggs of the American League Against Capital Punishment, Mrs. Charles Goldsmith, secretary of the Board of Public Welfare, Rabbi Abram Simon, Joseph A. Berberich and Charles McNerny. The document states that Harris, charged with killing an alleged gambler in Washington on the morning of April 21, 1932, was actually 230 miles away at the time. It is further reported that Harris was inadequately defended, being wholly without funds, and that during the trial, conducted during a gambler scare in Washington, he was not even called to the stand in his defense. Evidence is presented to show that Harris was convicted on ex-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It Droppeth As

Rain from Heaven, by S. N. Behrman. Golden Theatre, December 24, 1934.

ONE OF Mr. Behrman's attributes as a dramatist is that he surprises people with things on the stage that they take for granted off it, or at least those do who ever heard a conversation or read a book. This is to say that Mr. Behrman's intention and direction are toward the civilized and literate. If I said sophisticated, which would be right also, I might be taken to imply those who know sugar daddies and the white lights or what's what by way of sin and hokum. It is, therefore, best to say civilized and literate. However it may drag at times and however entertain, "Rain from Heaven" at least moves among words and thoughts and cerebral values. It is also as gentle as Shakespeare could ever have wanted justice to be. I am not sure that the play is not too gentle, in that it softens and glozes the tragic point so often, and falls into a mild analysis that merely brings up another line of Shakespeare's: 'twere to consider too curiously to consider so.

Mr. Behrman's play more or less talks its way through to the dénouement, which is one way of doing it. The talk varies, sometimes quick, subtle and good, sometimes rather lost between the epigrammatic or comic intention and a more direct realism. In Lady Wingate's house a number of people are met: a rich American and the brother he has made famous by paying for expeditions to the South Pole—Hobart Eldridge and Rand Eldridge—plus, for the ladies, Phoebe Eldridge and Joan Eldridge, the latter in love with a Jewish musician whom we are to believe a fine artist but a sorry piece of humanity. Meanwhile there is Nikolai Jurin, the Russian exile, supposed, doubtless, to afford us the lubrications of a sort of objective and detached subjectivity. And meanwhile there is, also, Hugo Willens, the Wandering Jew of the mind, so to speak, composed of an ancient unrest, wailing wall, personal charm, deliberately self-accepted powers of suffering, and a certain contempt for such emotions and simple ructions that mean nothing to him either racially or profitably. He does not wish contentment, he devotes his self-consciousness to the luxury of the tortured and timeless. Meanwhile, too, there is Lady Wingate—Lady Violet—who endows a liberal weekly, but is not a Communist or pattern for Hobart Eldridge's conservative fears and dreads. She represents, in a way, a certain British adjustability or unlogical muddling through, comfortable living along with unconcern about worldly assets, simplicity based on complete assurance of position. We must add to that the poignancy of feeling in Lady Violet and the liberation of impulse and commitment that makes her start a love affair with the Jew, Hugo Willens. You can scarcely blame her for the choice, since the dramatist has chosen to present an Anglo-Saxon South Polar hero whose nature and processes are as simple as a motto, though not so well written.

In the end Hugo Willens departs to suffer and fulfill himself on the outskirts of Germany, the persecutor of his race; and Lady Violet remains to remain herself. In the course of things there is a highly effective contrast between her side and evasive on his; though the playwright has not made this count as effectively as might be or as justly.

In the performance by the company a defect arises from the conflict of two styles, or methods, or treatments of the play. For some time after the first curtain we wonder now if "Rain from Heaven" is in the artificial comedy method, now if it is realistic. The players themselves increase this uncertainty up to the very last quarter of the performance. If Miss Jane Cowl is to play the role of Lady Violet as she does, simply, naturally and as an actuality out of life, then Miss Lily Cahill is wrong to play the role of the silly Phoebe Eldridge as artifically and obviously as she does. Entertaining as her performance may be, it ends by being almost like a number. On the other hand Miss Cowl has to struggle, in the first part of the play especially, with lines that must be either foolish and strained, taken as nature, or else lively and epigrammatic, taken as artifice. Miss Cahill's performance is effective but undoubtedly a bit out, according to the rest of the production. She may play certain spots as killingly and numberishly as she does now, but needs to reduce more of her performance to the plain actuality that the rest of the company preserve. I would suggest but one thing to Miss Cowl, that in certain passages where the dramatist is patently amusing himself with epigrams, periods or antitheses—these are chiefly in the first half of the play—she merely take the game for what it is worth and play up the fun of it. In such passages we have to face the fact that the dramatist's heroine is either amusing herself or is a little heavy. For the rest, Miss Cowl brings to her performance that gracious care and rightness that belong to her work as an actress. In a strange luminous way she suggests the English things which the dramatist implies, and in which the Jew, Willens, finds his guarantee and peace, and against which he revolts into the tumult of his future. Mr. John Halliday as Willens is good, the concluding ideas of the role are safely conveyed. Mr. Ben Smith plays the exploring brother, Rand, convincingly.

It would be a good time now for Mr. Behrman to take stock of his method and results. "Rain from Heaven" needs a more distinct marking of its inner rhythm. That is to say, there will be passages where the action of the story is to be forwarded, passages where the emotional intensity gathers, or where the talk should score for its own sake and the sake of the dramatic aftermath. We may add, moreover, that so far as the delivery end of it goes, such dialogue as Mr. Behrman's might even do well to annotate the lines as a musician might his score, to slow up here, hasten there, to rest, to staccato the expression, et cetera.

The trouble, what's more, would not be wasted if Mr. Behrman went through his dialogue to find where it is weakened by a certain explicitness. For example, there is a place where Lady Violet says something about being given enough time and she will pick herself up. It is not necessary to add, "I am irrepressible." There is, also, a curtain that belongs really to Miss Cowl, but that is dragged from her by the lover's adding something, explanatory but already implied, about "twenty minutes ago." In a great many places the dialogue lines go on to make more articulate things that are already inherent and clear—which means that we have sections of dead organism piled on what is alive. As racial discussion Mr. Behrman's play is, we may say,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

The Good Earthling

MRS. BUCK'S new novel, "A House Divided,"[1] is honest, rich, full-bodied and in general good enough to justify the adjectives that reviewers will lavish on it. Nevertheless it would have seemed a great deal better if it had appeared twelve months ago, before the publication of "Man's Fate" and "A Chinese Testament." This doesn't mean that she has been even slightly influenced by Malraux or Tretiakov. On the contrary, she has completed her trilogy of Chinese life exactly as she must have planned it from the first, taking what she regards as the three most vigorous Chinese types—the farmer, the war lord, the student—and treating them in three long novels that together summarize fifty years in the life of a family and a nation. It happens, however, that the student-hero of her new novel strongly resembles the student-hero of "A Chinese Testament"—not for any reason of literary derivation, but simply because the type is widely prevalent in China and because both Tretiakov and Mrs. Buck have portrayed it honestly. It also happens that the first section of "A House Divided" deals with the same period of the Chinese revolution that was more fully treated in "Man's Fate." The two comparisons force themselves on the reader. Mrs. Buck suffers in both cases, for the other books, in their different ways, are better as literature, more vivid, more compelling.

I would not say that they are truer to Chinese life. Mrs. Buck has spent so many years in the country, has studied the language so well, has lived on such terms of friendship with the people, that she makes Tretiakov and Malraux seem like tourists dropping ashore from a round-the-world cruise. She has a truly extraordinary gift for presenting the Chinese, not as quaint and illogical, yellow-skinned, exotic devil-dolls, but as human beings merely, animated by motives we can always understand even when the background is strange and topsy-turvy. The Chinese themselves are in general eager to praise her work; many of them say that no native writer has painted a more accurate picture of their country. A few Chinese critics have attacked her, but usually because they stood to the left or right of her politically—either they were Communist sympathizers or else they were the violent sort of patriots who hate all foreigners and want to go back to the good old Confucian customs. Mrs. Buck instinctively takes a middle course. She seems to know China so well that she no longer judges it even from the standpoint of "the native Chinese"—whoever he may be—but rather from the standpoint of a particular class, the one that includes the liberal, three-quarters Westernized scholars who deplore the graft and cruelty of the present government but nevertheless keep their heads on their shoulders and hold their noses and support General Chiang Kai-shek, because they are afraid of what would happen if he were overthrown.

The hero of "A House Divided" belongs to this class. Mrs. Buck presents him with deep sympathy, but she does not succeed in making his character seem admirable or even likable. Wang the Student is the grandson of Wang the Farmer, described in "The Good Earth"; he is the son of Wang the Tiger, described in "Sons"; but he has lost the simple sense of direction that held his ancestors to their path. He is a neither-nor sort of person. Thus, he can neither take the side of the new ruling classes, whose cruelty offends his heart, nor work beside the proletarians and peasants, whose smell offends his nostrils; he can neither wholly adopt Western customs nor revert to the ways of his fathers. Unable to fight toward any fixed goal, he must always hesitate, see the good mingled with the evil without being able to weigh them in the balance. He could never be the hero of a great drama, for, being blind to his own destiny, he can neither accept it nor rebel against it.

In the classical age of Corneille and Racine there was a rule that only kings or queens could be the subject of tragedies. The rule, I think, was not entirely nonsense, for it meant that tragedies enacted themselves on a high stage built, as it were, of human conflicts and aspirations. Translated into modern terms, it would mean that novels and dramas should deal preferably with men and women who are in a high degree conscious of themselves, of the parts they play in the world, of the social conditions by which they are molded (and which in turn they help to mold). They should deal, in other words, not with the typical or average but with the *representative*. Particularly in a novel that describes a revolutionary crisis, it is a mistake, I think, to present a hero who sees only the blank underside of events and cannot even choose the side he wants to fight for. The real dramas take place among the planners, the agitators, the new leaders thrown up violently by the masses like rocks from a volcano—and, on the other hand, among the capitalists and generals who are organizing their counterplots and trying to buy or bully a mass support for themselves. This is the sound principle that André Malraux followed in writing "Man's Fate," and it is one of the reasons why the climax of the novel has the power of a great tragedy. His revolutionists are in a prison yard waiting to be burned alive—but they have all known the cause they were fighting for, they have calculated the risks they were running, and now, at the moment of death, they find a bitter and exalted reward in their feeling of nearness to one another. . . . It happens that Mrs. Buck describes a similar scene in "A House Divided." Scores of Chinese students are arrested for having revolutionary literature; they are kept moaning in a cell overnight and then, in the morning, they are driven out to be killed. It is pathetic and strong enough, but it is also rather futile, for the victims have no very clear idea of the cause for which they are dying. The cutting short of all their lives seems less a tragedy than a regrettable and essentially meaningless accident.

As for the other book I mentioned, "A Chinese Testament," it suggests a different lesson. It is not a novel at all: the author calls it a "bio-interview," and explains that he gathered his material by talking every day for six months to a typical Chinese student. Artistically his experiment was altogether successful. The lesson his book suggests is that, if a writer wishes to describe a typical rather than a representative figure, he might do so in the form of a life-document based accurately on real events. A life-document has several advantages over a novel. It does not require a formal plot ending, for example, with Wang the Student embracing his beloved Mei-ling outside th[illegible]

[1] A House Divided, by Pearl S. Buck. New York: Reynal and Hitchcock (a Joh[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lies dying. It can begin anywhere and end anywhere; it can introduce all sorts of relevant material; and it permits any type of interpretative treatment—provided only that the writer remains faithful always to the truth that is not necessarily stranger than fiction, but is likely to be richer in color, contrast and meaning. MALCOLM COWLEY.

The Literary Racket

Author Hunting, by Grant Richards. New York: Coward-McCann. 333 pages. $3.50.

The Georgian Scene: A Literary Panorama, by Frank Swinnerton. New York: Farrar and Rinehart. 530 pages. $3.50.

MR. GRANT RICHARDS has made a readable account of his thirty years in the business and the sport of publisher and author. Along with much small beer he chronicles a few exciting experiences in big-game hunting, such as the Dreiser episodes, the publication of the early Shaw plays, of "The Shropshire Lad," etc. Although, as he frequently boasts, he possessed a "flair" that often led him to pick the winners, to back a long shot (one drops instinctively into the racing or stock-market vernacular), he made his mistakes, as when he failed to accept Masefield's offer of "Pompey the Great":

> No publisher worthy of his job, if he has any money left in his banking account, will, if he can help it, allow an author whose work he respects and admires to go elsewhere. In the long run things will come right—and even if they don't—well, he will have the happiness and satisfaction of having been true to his own taste and of having on his shelves good books of which he is proud rather than rubbish which he has acquired in the mistaken belief that he knows what the public wants.

That is a high note, for a publisher, and Mr. Grant Richards maintained it more steadily than most of his rivals. He cared for books apart from their ledger returns, however often his vision may have been deflected by the temporary reputations of their authors. He genuinely grieved over not having published Theodore Dreiser's "Sister Carrie," yet one may not agree that "if Frank Norris had had his way, if Doubleday had published it as he wished and had given it the full prestige of the firm's name and backing"—Mrs. Doubleday had objected to the morality of "Sister Carrie," and although not able to suppress the book had influenced her husband to kill it—"if I had taken Norris' repeated advice and had produced it in its entirety in England . . . well, a great reputation would have been built five years sooner than it was, and perhaps the whole course of American literary history might have been altered." Just how?

Mr. Richards thus sums up the essence of his long experience in trying to pick winners:

> There are still intelligent people who believe that publishers can forecast the success of a book, and that, by some cunning of their own, they can avoid losses on any book. . . . It is now more difficult to judge beforehand than ever it was, and now more than ever, even when a book has seemed to have scored a success, it brings to its author but a trumpery wage. Personally, I see danger in the herd instinct as applied to literary supply and demand. Lined up by book societies, marshalled by literary journalists, brought to obedience by public have now all to read the same books in the same seasons. . . . There are more books than there ever were; the skill with which they are written is greatly superior to that shown in the books of a generation ago; the number of readers has immeasurably increased. And yet fewer authors are being kept pleasantly alive by the labor of their pens. In fact the tendency is for the herd instinct to make a few writers greatly popular and to leave the greater number to neglect.

Wise, but hardly wise enough! Did it ever occur to Mr. Richards how much his own enterprising methods of picking winners, with the bait of large advances, etc., had done to create "herd literature"?

Mr. Swinnerton's "The Georgian Scene" is on a different, a more "literary" plane. His point of view is that of the publisher's silent partner, of the reader and literary adviser reviewing the literary product and its creators, as a whole, over two generations. As is natural from having been the "contact man" for a publishing firm all these years, as well as a minor craftsman himself, his observations are less breezy than Mr. Grant Richards', more those of the literary tea or of the intimate interview. He has mingled personalities, "thumbnail sketches," of his authors with more general criticism: *e.g.*, "In person Hueffer is a large, rather unwieldy, fair man whose mouth, like Coleridge's, is always open. . . . I must not forget to mention that when he wishes to do so he writes with eloquence and beauty." And of Miss Rose Macaulay: "She is tall, slender to thinness, has very pale blue eyes and a delicate fair complexion, and is a lady." Of such tidbits literary reputations are made.

Yet Mr. Swinnerton realizes that "in the long run, the author's personality and the accidents of his birth should not and do not affect a judgment of the value of his work." There being no discoverable stable standards or aims in literature (except that of pleasing somebody), the sudden shifts of fashion in books are obviously bewildering to Mr. Swinnerton:

> A man because his talent is exceptional rises above his fellows. No merely advertised person can do this for more than a season. But the moment a genuine talent has established itself in any certainty of reputation, the fashion changes; a new crowd comes in (much as a new South American government comes in) and sweeps out, as far as it can do, all traces of the older fashion.

Mr. Swinnerton's "panorama" of these swiftly changing fashions and reputations is both tolerant and fluent. His own middle-of-the-road judgments of his contemporaries will appeal to many readers, harassed by the antic opinions of literary cliques, while the reading lists appended to the volume will serve as a useful guide through the maze of mass publication.

These two books on the commercial production of literature suggest unconsciously the defects of the competitive profit system as applied to letters, a defect as devastating and as obvious as its application today to social economy. Under forced draft (the credit system of "advances"), the overproduction and standardization of books are inevitable, with periodic gluts and wastes, as in the markets for more material goods. It is apparent that too many books have been published, especially too many mediocre ones, and that successful authors like Shaw, Wells, Bennett (mentioning only prominent names) have been induced to overproduce, and to merchandise much inferior work. Almost any other system of literary production might be expected to succeed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing individual fortunes for publisher or author, but in the creation of good and enduring literature and, what is possibly of more importance, in educating human taste. As a random suggestion, if every author desirous of publishing a book were obliged to do a certain amount of hard manual labor to earn the right of publication, and were limited to a reasonable number of permitted publications, say one a year for twenty years, the chaotic conditions would cease. . . . Meanwhile, before the coming of Utopia, another five years of what Mr. Richards calls "the Slump" will do the cause of literature no harm, should it result in cutting down the output one-half and forcing publishers to exercise more caution in picking their winners. ROBERT HERRICK.

Calverton on Religion

The Passing of the Gods, by V. F. Calverton. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 344 pages. $3.

THIS IS the first of two studies in which V. F. Calverton proposes to analyze the cultural forms that have determined the *interests* of the mind. The subject of "The Passing of the Gods" is religion; the second and later study will deal with nationalism and property.

> In the past [Mr. Calverton says] the general practice has been to treat the mind from the psychological point of view. What we must do . . . is to learn to treat the mind from the sociological point of view. The mind, when all is said, is a social and not an individual product. Without the social fact, attaining intellectual continuity through tradition, the human mind could never have evolved. To understand the development of the human mind, therefore, we must understand the social forces which created and conditioned it.

His basic argument, of course, is that the development of the mind has been conditioned by economic factors. But in his zeal to get to the bottom of our habit-response organization system (he indiscriminately uses the figure of speech: *mind,* and indulges in such metaphysical tosh as: "the individual cannot find himself nor develop his full powers by means of centrifugal extension but only by means of centripetal intensity") he becomes more obtuse, dogmatic and visionless than the functional anthropologists whom he dismisses, and with ample reason. For in his emphasis on the social character of the mind he loses sight of the fact that a consideration of the individual mind involves personal, physiological processes as well as external stimuli. He hides the personalities of the priests, the military and political castes and the property owners (the true cultural determiners) behind such rubrics as "social forces." He begins with cultural forms as though they were first cause; making use of a device that has no other function than the easy establishment of his particular thesis. However, in the sections of "The Passing of the Gods" devoted to an analysis of the material interests that organized religion has served throughout the ages "by endowing man with an illusion of power over the forces of nature and the cosmos," Mr. Calverton's contribution makes the present volume a fair, exciting synthesis of Weber's "Protestant Ethic," Tawney's "Religion and the Rise of Capitalism," and Hall's "The Religious Background of American Culture"—all classics.

Mr. Calverton believes that with the development of the higher barbarian states and Christianity (when religion took on a more teleological aspect) the dominating classes of society had need of religion for two fundamental purposes. First, it [illegible] pressed and exploited subjects. This drug lulled the people to sleep and stimulated dreams of a happy life in Heaven. In the second place, it was a source of psychic energy, a reservoir of courage, from which the rulers constantly drew the necessary strength for carrying on the difficult task of ruling in a world made more complicated by the rise of science. They charged their subjects with religious energy of so great an intensity that they were able to overcome almost all obstacles. Thus, Mr. Calverton concludes that people living in misery inevitably feed on the lotus of religion if they are not class-conscious. With the development of class-consciousness, however, based on the gradual communization of the means of production and distribution, the human mind will be able to substitute the creative idealism of radical thinking (Marxism) for the consolatory but degenerative opium of religion.

In so far as Mr. Calverton wishes to free the human mind from superstition, he is doing an extremely valuable job. But his quasi-scientific deductions on the genesis and function of mind, in which he employs the synthetic language of the group, amount to wishful thinking, and consequently do marked damage to the greater, more valid issue at stake. He speaks glibly of "normality as an absolute," yet advances no synthetic method for the attainment of such a norm. And he has committed the fallacy of assuming that religious feeling must be exorcised altogether. The religious feeling, of course, would merely be directed into new channels, and its outward expression would take new forms. ERIC ESTORICK.

Marxian Fragment

Letters to Dr. Kugelmann, by Karl Marx. New York: International Publishers. 148 pages. $1.50.

THESE extremely interesting letters from Marx in England to his friend Dr. Kugelmann in Germany cover the period of the publication of "Das Kapital" and of the Paris Commune, and throw a great deal of light on Marx's ideas in connection with both events. The fighter of 1848 revives in the scholar of the British Museum. "I have now attacked Gladstone [on the Irish question]," he wrote in 1869, "just as I formerly attacked Palmerston. The demagogic refugees here love to fall upon the Continental despots from a safe distance. That sort of thing only attracts me when it happens *vultu instantis tyranni.*" And in 1871, when his address on "The Civil War in France" had excited public feeling against him, "I have the honor," he wrote, "to be at this moment the best calumniated and the most menaced man in London. That really does me good after a tedious twenty years' idyll in my den." Let us hope that International will soon give us a translation of the whole of the Marx-Engels correspondence. It is curious to reflect that there exists in English no complete translation of Marx and Engels, and that they remain at the present time rather inaccessible even in German. The Soviets had set out to publish a splendidly edited complete Marx and Engels; but the printing was being done in Germany and, when Hitler got in, it had to stop. It was true a short time ago at any rate that the Russian complete translation was ahead of the original text. In 1785, Beaumarchais had to go to Germany to print his first collected edition of Voltaire and had to smuggle it back into France and hide it. Today, when Marx has been dead fifty years, his writings are forbidden in his own country, and the only collected edition is in Ru[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

William Cardinal O'Connell

Recollections of Seventy Years, by His Eminence, William Cardinal O'Connell. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company. 395 pages. $3.50.

HIS EMINENCE, Cardinal O'Connell of Boston, has written a book about himself; but not—he is explicit here—for his own aggrandisement. Historical value purely is his hope. And a noble hope it is. But the historian who would be convincing must have his facts right, or people who know the facts will suspect his sincerity, as Catholic laymen in Boston are doing right now. Thus:

His Eminence quotes his predecessor in the Boston See, Archbishop Williams, as being delighted with his (O'Connell's) appointment as his coadjutor—the fact being, as thousands of the Boston laity know, that the old Archbishop, who was truly a saintly man, dispatched his Cathedral Rector, Father John Mullen, to Rome in the hope of having the appointment annulled.

Again: His Eminence names President Theodore Roosevelt as one of his admirers, when the fact is that while Roosevelt had many strong friendships in the Catholic hierarchy, he also had two pet aversions among them, one here and one abroad. The one here was Cardinal O'Connell, and Mr. Roosevelt made no bones of saying so to his Boston Catholic friends.

From the two preceding paragraphs we may guess that His Eminence is on the spot with Boston laymen. Being largely of Irish blood, these laymen are great people to have with you, but they are tough hombres when they take to riding a man they do not like. For twenty-seven years (they say) the publicity staff of His Eminence has been toiling incessantly to convince the world that he is a great man. Probably his final effort toward that end is this book, in which he writes of how much better than his predecessor he has handled the diocesan finances. It makes lovely reading (say the laity), but some exact figures instead of large vague statements would please us better: for twenty-seven years you have been in sole control of the immense revenues of this great diocese, and churches that were not in debt—plenty of them—twenty-seven years ago, are heavily in debt today, and the laity, not you, have to pay the freight. What we would like to read is just what has become of the millions of the Keith bequest: what has happened to the Bishop Anderson estate to which you appointed one of your in-laws as executor: what of the O'Sullivan estate: what of the Higgins will suit, which you settled out of court: and why did your lawyer petition the court to have the papers in that case impounded, thereby preventing the inquisitive public from looking over the evidence?

You quote (say the laity) praiseful things said of you by various exalted personages, which is fine, but these would read better if the people you so quote were not all dead. What of the living (barring the professional Catholics and politicians)? You write of your frequent pious meditations, your many lonely prayerful vigils, and we will not dispute them. We cannot, they being known only to yourself and your God; but some things we can dispute. You tell of the high honor in which you have been held by the high dignitaries of the Church—dead dignitaries. In June of last year you celebrated your Golden Jubilee, your fifty years as an ordained priest. There are, not reckoning Boston, three Cardinals, twelve Archbishops, ninety-seven Bishops in the United States. There is also an Apostolic Delegate, [illegible] the Holy Father. That makes 113 in all. Not a single one showed up to honor you during that Jubilee Celebration, and you are the dean of the American hierarchy. You might have waited and added a chapter to your book to explain that (so the laity murmur).

His Eminence writes of how simply he lives, and the laity count off the various beach houses he has bought, the several country homes, the six or eight city residences—some bought for his poor relations, it is true, but most of them for his own living, and all costly and all paid for out of the diocesan treasury. And there is his tropic winter castle, to which he retreats annually after the Christmas holidays, returning in time, however, for the Easter collections. He writes of how hard he works, and the laity dilate upon his long and frequent and expensive absences from his diocesan duties. Gangplank Bill is their nickname for him.

Now to view His Eminence's autobiography through the eyes of the Boston Catholic laity may not seem like a fair review; but why isn't it? What must prevail for any Catholic priest's book is the judgment of Catholic laity and, above all, the laity among whom he has lived (when he isn't abroad) for more than half his working years.

For my own notion of the book: I have to say that one hundred pages or so of personal minutiae could be deleted with advantage. It reads now as if His Eminence has included in his record every man and woman of importance that he ever was introduced to, or spent an evening with, or strolled down the street with, or played the piano to. The connotation of all this, as this professional writer gets it, is that a man who has been intimate with so many charming and great people must be a charming and great man himself. He reminds me in this of those war correspondents who sat around with staff generals fighting the Battle of Paris, and incidentally becoming very martial folk themselves.

JAMES B. CONNOLLY.

Martyr of Progress

Condorcet and the Rise of Liberalism in France, by J. Salwyn Schapiro. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 311 pages. $3.50.

THE Marquis de Condorcet, who was born in 1743, was, at the age of nineteen, an active member of the band of *Philosophes* who were remaking European civilization and press-agenting the coming revolution. As a mathematician he was a contributor to Diderot's Encyclopedia; as a writer and sociologist he was a friend of Voltaire and a lieutenant to the reformer-statesman, Turgot. He shared the hatred of these men for feudal institutions and also their belief that an age of reason and enlightenment was flowering. But he alone, virtually, of all the company of eighteenth-century *Philosophes,* atheists and free-traders, lived to witness the fall of the Bastille and to take a leading part in the organization of the First Republic in France. Thus, as Professor Schapiro shows, Condorcet sitting in the councils of the French Revolution represents the generation of Voltaire, Rousseau and Turgot. He enacts for us the tragedy of the intellectual turned statesman.

The political action of this *Philosophe* was noble enough in purpose; Condorcet was capable of true heroism in behalf of his ideas. Yet, abstract and remote from men in spirit, he proved too confused and indecisive for the electric times in which he lived. The best of him was in his writings, his projects for social and educational reform; and to these the biographer devotes the greatest part of his study.

Condorcet, who was neither so eloquent nor so original [illegible] Voltaire or Montesquieu,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

made contributions to European thought that were almost as solid as theirs. He is presented here as the apostle of liberalism in trade and government, a liberalism that was widely accepted almost up to the end of the nineteenth century. (I think it would have been more accurate historically to call him "libertarian.") He pleaded as strongly for feminism and free birth control as for free voting and free capitalism. Besides, no French thinker did more to carry over to Europe the principles of the new American democracy than this friend of Franklin and Paine. But most of Condorcet's halo derives from his posthumous "Sketch of the Intellectual Progress of Mankind," which he wrote during the days when he lay hidden from the Terror. Here as never before was crystalized the idea of human progress. The proscribed *Philosophe,* with but a few hours more to live, announces the ultimate triumph of science and truth over barbarism, epitomizing in his *beau geste* the whole eighteenth-century Enlightenment.

After great success in the nineteenth century the idea of progress once more needs defenders who are ready to die for it. Professor Schapiro, perhaps wisely, refrains from such defense, remarking that "poverty has dogged progress . . ." which is true of its libertarian phase, though it may not necessarily be true of later phases. In other respects one appreciates the biographer's intelligent and extensive scholarship. There is little portraiture of the appealing Condorcet, such as he plainly merited; this work is indeed a dispassionate exposition of ideas rather than of a man. But then I have read no one recently who is more at home in the ideas of the eighteenth century or more objective in interpreting them. MATTHEW JOSEPHSON.

Books in Brief

The Sentimental Years: 1836-1860, by E. Douglas Branch. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 432 pages. $4.

THIS IS a more important book than its title, its charming Victorian jacket and its many amusing illustrations suggest, but no less entertaining. It is an interpretation of American life, culled from old newspapers, letters and books, acutely perceived, solidly evaluated, wittily presented, with an eye to the picturesque but mainly to the underlying and persistent elements. This is the period of the emergent middle class, of expanding industrial and technical prosperity, whose immature romanticism expressed itself in piety and acquisitiveness, political idealism and economic ruthlessness. The author has found that "nothing is old" and "very little is new." From the brilliant first chapter, "Progress and a Doubt," to the last, "The Ostrich in the Sand," the thread of continuity leads us through the maze of characters, events and social movements to the final synthesis. Business and railroads, literature, art and invention, politics, homes, churches, schools, libraries and factories, newspapers, cartoons and songs, feminism, temperance, phrenology and spiritualism, private —all the human antics, tragic, comic, noble and vile—fill the picture with life; and having thoroughly enjoyed ourselves we emerge with a clarified understanding of the forces that made us what we are today. C. G. S.

The Science of Work, by Morris S. Viteles. New York: W. W. Norton and Company. 453 pages. $3.75.

This is a popular abridgement of the author's bulky monograph, "Industrial Psychology," published in 1932. As such it [illegible] ment to take place within the [illegible] the entire field of human labor. Dr. Viteles' work as consultant for a number of large corporations (including the Philadelphia Electric Company) explains both the extent of his knowledge and the curious *entrepreneur* bias with which much of his valuable material is interpreted. But the layman who wants to know what is behind such current expressions as "efficiency," "personnel work," "speed-up" and "stretch-out" tricks for circumventing various N.R.A. codes, can do no better than read this book, not forgetting to look between the lines. Machines and monotony; time and motion-study analysis (why is there no mention of the infamous "Bedaux system," so bitterly attacked in English textile and other factories); personnel fallacies; matching men to jobs and vice versa; accidents, their cause and prevention (an excellent chapter); industrial management and relations (the "company union" is praised with faint damns); technological unemployment—it is all here, together with odds and ends of history and philosophy, numerous charts, tables, diagrams and funny little pictures: all of it presented with considerable skill, and all seemingly intended to reconcile man to the dignity—if not yet the security—of human labor. H. W.

Vae Victis: The Life of Ludwig von Benedek, by John Presland. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company. 366 pages. $5.

Benedek was a commoner, the son of a Hungarian doctor who had pulled Radetzky through a serious illness. In gratitude, Radetzky recommended the boy to the Austrian military academy. In 1848-49, and again in 1859, Benedek proved himself a competent soldier. There were few competent soldiers in the Austrian army, and Benedek became famous and popular. In 1866 he was made commander-in-chief of the army opposed to the Prussians—over his own protestations of unfitness for the task—because the ruling circles expected defeat and wished to divert public anger from themselves. Even if Benedek had had a genius for strategy and had been supported by competent officers, the Prussian needle gun or breech-loader, which was much superior to the Austrian muzzle-loader, would have won the war for the Prussians. But since Benedek was only a brave fighting general and most of his officers were incompetent, the Austrian army collapsed in the shortest campaign in history, and Benedek was made the scapegoat of a governmental system, the justice and wisdom of which he never doubted. Mr. Presland's account of the man is sympathetic, well informed concerning the times, and pleasantly written. H. S.

The Plight of the Bituminous Coal Miner, by Homer Lawrence Morris. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press. 267 pages. $3.

How to provide a means of livelihood for the more than 200,000 workers who are "surplus" bituminous coal miners is the problem with which Mr. Morris is concerned. Except for an inaccurate and prejudiced account of the National Miners' Union and its sympathizers, the facts presented in his book are well documented. Most of the general figures on the industry as a whole are from the U. S. Bureau of Mines. The book contains both reports on Mr. Morris' own intensive study of 956 jobless miners in 19 counties of Kentucky and West Virginia in the winter and spring of 1932, and the easy optimism of one who would cure the capitalist malady by some sort of back-to-the-land move-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Disloyalty in the Confederacy, by Georgia Lee Tatum. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press. 187 pages. $2.50.

Though 600,000 men out of a population of 8,000,000 whites offered their services to the Confederacy in the first year of the Civil War, before its close disaffection and active disloyalty in every Confederate state had seriously weakened the Southern cause. The reasons for this disaffection were many: loyalty to the Union and apathy toward secession, the resentment of the poor whites at being drafted to fight "a rich man's war," an intense sectionalism within the seceding states themselves, the pacifist influence of certain foreign and Quaker groups. Opposition was intensified, as the war continued, by the intense suffering it caused, by the apparent and increasing hopelessness of the Confederate cause, as well as by resentment against the conscription, impressment and tax-in-kind acts passed by the Confederate government. The disaffected poor-white element was further made bitter by the exemption granted under the Conscription Act to certain slave owners and overseers and especially by its substitute clause. The disloyal in many cases formed secret societies, the most powerful of which were the Order of the Heroes of America, the Peace Society and the Peace and Constitutional Society. Miss Tatum tells the story of their origin and activities in a solid and well documented study. M. G.

Erasmus of Rotterdam, by Stefan Zweig. New York: The Viking Press. 247 pages. $3.

Stefan Zweig sees Erasmus as "the first conscious European," a great internationalist, a lover of peace, freedom and scholarly pursuits, a lonely figure in the midst of the brutal world conflict which he abhorred and in which he could not espouse either side. The parallel with the liberalism of today is both implicit and explicit. This tribute to a man is the credo of a way of life now in eclipse, a cry of courage and hope from the depths. For "Erasmus the conquered," who "broke the trail in the world of literature for humanistic ideals," is seen as the pioneer of a great tradition that suffers a thousand deaths only to know a thousand resurrections, and we are told that "hope arises all the stronger precisely at those moments when confusion and horror are abroad in the land . . . and men and nations can find their true and sacred measure only by making suprapersonal and hardly realizable claims."

C. G. S.

Contributors

HAROLD J. LASKI, a member of the faculty of the London School of Economics, is the author of several volumes on social and economic subjects. Among them are "The Foundations of Sovereignty and Other Essays" and "Democracy in Crisis."

KARL SCHRIFTGIESSER, for ten years on the staff of The Boston Evening Transcript, is at present an editorial and feature writer for The Washington Post.

JOSEPHINE MILES writes us: "I was born in Chicago in 1911, am distinctly a Southern Californian (that blighted being, according to rumor), and am doing graduate work at the University of California at Berkeley. I've just lately had poems accepted by Poetry and The Saturday Review and still feel surprised."

HORACE GREGORY writes articles on literature and painting for many magazines and is the author of two volumes of poetry, "Chelsea Rooming House" and "No Retreat."

ROBERT HERRICK, the well known novelist, for many years professor of English at the University of Chicago, has just been appointed Government Secretary of the Virgin Islands. He is the author, among many other books, of "Together" and "The Common Lot."

ERIC ESTORICK has contributed literary articles and reviews to various magazines and is the author of a forthcoming volume of literary criticism.

JAMES B. CONNOLLY, author of "Out of Gloucester" and other books of the sea, is one of the more prominent Catholic laymen in Cardinal O'Connell's diocese.

MATTHEW JOSEPHSON is the author, among other books, of "The Robber Barons," "Jean Jacques Rousseau" and "The Life and Times of Emile Zola." He is now working on a new book and has just returned from a trip to the South.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Clara Gruening Stillman, Harold Ward, Herman Simpson and Martha Gruening.

LECTURES

COOPER UNION
Dept. of Social Philosophy
(Formerly The People's Institute)
IN THE GREAT HALL
8th Street and Astor Place—At 8 o'clock
Admission Free

Friday, January 25th
EVERETT DEAN MARTIN
"The Importance of a Knowledge of History—Lucian."

Sunday, January 27th
PROFESSOR SCOTT BUCHANAN
"The Nature of Institutions."

Tuesday, January 29th
PROFESSOR SCOTT BUCHANAN
"Reform."

GRAMOPHONE RECORDS

MUSIC LOVERS—100,000 of the finest records in the world on sale at 50c & 75c per record (value $1.50 & $2). The Symphonies, Chamber Music, Operas, etc., of BACH, BEETHOVEN, BRAHMS, MOZART, WAGNER, etc. MAIL ORDERS, CATALOGUE. THE GRAMOPHONE SHOP, Inc., 18 E. 48th St., New York City.

LANGUAGE

Russian Taught
Simplified Method Translations
MISS ISA WILGA
457 West 57th Street
New York COlumbus 5-8450

DANCE

CAMP UNITY
Reunion and Dance
Red Vaudeville by W. L. T.
Unity Trio—Choruses
Dancing until 3 A. M.
at the
NEW STAR CASINO
107th St. & Park Ave., New York City
SAT. JAN. 19
Tickets in advance, 50c; at door, 75c. On sale at Workers' Bookshop, 50 E. 13th St., New York City.

GENERAL

WHY BE DISCONTENTED? Or defeated by environment? Or depressed by loneliness? Write 434, Spokane, Washington. Enclose postage.

ORANGES FOR SALE

Oranges, sweet, juicy, sun-ripened on trees; picked, shipped same day. Delivered express prepaid, $3.50 bushel basket. Tangerines, $3.75; Grapefruit, $3.00. Satisfaction guaranteed. A. H. Burket, Sebring, Fla.

MAGAZINES

BETTER TIMES — the news weekly which covers all the health and welfare activities in the metropolitan New York district tersely and accurately. Sample copies upon request.
BETTER TIMES
122 East 22nd Street New York City

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
"The Progressive"
Regular Price $1.50 Per Year
STARTLING FACTS suppressed by other papers are being exposed NOW! Inside story of the new 3rd party. Send 20 cents today for the next 12 sensational issues.
Special Offer 3 Months - 13 - ISSUES 20c
The Progressive, Dept. M, Madison, Wis.

ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED